THE

# CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLVIII.] FEBRUARY, 1858. [Vol. XIV.

## MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. GEORGE ARMSTRONG, OF BRISTOL*.

Among Mr. Armstrong's registered thoughts and feelings during the year 1833, there again occur several allusions to Dr. Channing's works, which seem to have been his constant companions, and to have ultimately completed his conversion to a form of Christianity which his mind had already adopted as the logical deduction from the writings of the New Testament, by shewing how fitted it was to exalt the soul, to deepen devotion, and satisfy the spiritual cravings of the heart.

On "Wednesday, July 3," he writes: "Dr. Channing—finished (second time) his volume of 'Discourses.' Bless the Lord, O my soul—all that is within me, bless the Lord—for his unbounded goodness in setting before me such glorious views of the religion of His Son! O what a host has Unitarian light and purity in this most gifted and most holy of its emissaries!"

During the autumn of this year (1833), he was much occupied in writing an essay, entitled "Euthanasy of the British Constitution," which appeared in the October number of Tait's Magazine. On the Christmas-day following, he thus records his final acceptance, as it were, of a faith which was henceforth his consolation and support under all life's trials, and whose defence, illustration and promotion, eventually became his chief business and delight:

"Wednesday, December 25.—One of the most exquisite days ever beheld at this time of the year, the first on which Mrs. A. went out since her illness. Lord, how manifold are thy mercies! Happy in the enjoyment of this lovely day:—how much *more* happy within, when praying and reading with ——— and her recovered mother, under the influence of Unitarian feelings, and *for the first time* accepting and dispensing the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the form of the Revised Book of Common Prayer! Closed this delightful service by a discourse of Dr. Channing on 'Knowing Christ, Ephes. vi. 24;' and in the fulness of my heart began a letter to this dear and noble apostle of unspotted and sublime Christianity."

How interesting and touching is this passage! And now that

* Continued from p. 18.

we can read it by the light of the writer's subsequent career, how we must honour the sincerity and respect the convictions of this confessor, who spent his last and best days in the advocacy of views of Christ's truth reached by a method so philosophical, and embraced by a faith so deeply spiritual!

A remarkable episode in Mr. Armstrong's life was his correspondence with the late Blanco White. It seems to have commenced in the year 1828, by Mr. Armstrong's sending a copy of his "Infallibility not possible" to Mr. White, then at Oxford, and to have been resumed in 1831, by what Mr. W. calls "an eloquent and ably written defence" of him by Mr. Armstrong against some violent and unjustifiable attacks of the Roman Catholic press. In Mr. White's letter of thanks for this generous interference, he thus alludes to Mr. Armstrong's retirement from the Church of England:

"I cannot but respect your motives, evinced, as they appear, by a sacrifice of temporal interest; though I sincerely lament the separation of one who, though known to me only in writing, has a claim on my respect and gratitude. But every mind has its own appropriate trial. Our theological inferences and conclusions are very different, yet our desire of following truth, and nothing but truth, I trust will excuse whichever of us may be in error."*

The sequel of this correspondence is curious, and alike creditable to both parties.

In 1834, Mr. White, in the meantime removed to Dublin to take up his residence in the family of Archbishop Whately, renewed his intercourse with Mr. Armstrong by a letter and a present of two little works written by him with the view "of conciliating Christians (who are worthy of that name) on points where human language cannot convey any definite notion, and is constantly exposed to contradict itself."† In fact, as Mr. White says somewhere else, his object was, from the regard with which Mr. Armstrong had inspired him, "to turn him from the error of his ways, and reconcile him to the Established Church."

Mr. Armstrong replied in due course to this communication; and his letters are so elaborate and eloquent a defence of his views, and so interesting a picture of his mind at this period, that it appears worth while to quote them at full length.

"Kilsharvan, August 4, 1834.

"My dear Sir,—If I have not at an earlier period replied to your letter of May 1st, accompanied by some of your very interesting publications,—which I duly received at this place,—it was that I might afford myself the opportunity, after my release

---

* See Life of Blanco White, by Rev. J. H. Thom, Vol. I. pp. 446, 476.

† Ibid. Vol. II. p. 41.

from some pressing occupations, of ascertaining, by an attentive perusal of those works, the full extent of the favour you had done me by offering them for my acceptance.

"I had not been aware, until you informed me yourself of the fact, of your residence in this country; and I take pleasure in believing that, so far as your health may permit, your present situation affords you facilities, which will not be thrown away, for contributing still further to our not very ample stock of pure and polished composition and bold and liberal theology.

"In reviewing all that I have hitherto learned of your character and your writings, while I see the evidence of attainments which far remove you from anything like a comparison with so humble an individual as myself, yet I can trace between your situation and my own, and between—I will not say our actual opinions, but our intellectual tendencies and habits, a resemblance so broad and strongly marked, that I cannot but avail myself with satisfaction of any opportunity that presents itself for strengthening an intercourse of minds which would seem to be connected by so close and peculiar an affinity. Often, when I have read that thought of the incomparable Locke on the subject of theology—'This is that science which would truly enlarge men's minds, were it studied, or permitted to be studied, every where with that freedom, love of truth and charity, which it teaches,'—it has occurred to me, how delightful a circumstance it would be for one mind thus disposed to meet with another of like complexion. Yet how rarely could such a coincidence be expected to happen! And here I am reminded of the sentiment of a writer, with whose imperishable pages I trust you are more than superficially acquainted,—I mean Dr. Channing. That great writer has remarked, that 'the claims of religion on intelligent men are not yet understood, and the low place which it holds among the objects of liberal inquiry will one day be recollected as the shame of our age.' It is wonderful that any mind, and especially a superior one, should not see in religion the highest object of thought. It is wonderful that the infinite God, the noblest theme of the universe, should be considered as a monopoly of professed theologians; that a subject so vast, awful and exalting, as our relation to the Divinity, should be left to *technical men*, to be handled so much for sectarian purposes.'

"Accordingly, of the two great divisions of society, laymen, alas! like Gallio, seem but little disposed 'to care for these things,' and, with either the carelessness of sceptics or the implicitness of papists, are contented to delegate to the 'parsons' the whole care and concern of religion. Yet who of the 'parsons' ever thinks of resolutely and in good earnest *examining?* Or if, here and there, one such may be found, by what extravagance of imagination could he hope to meet with such another as himself? How, indeed, can it be otherwise, seeing that the

very essence of their profession is first to take up 'opinions,' as Locke again expresses it, 'which best comport with their power, profit or credit, and *then* to seek arguments to support them'? Which one, out of a thousand of them, when once he has entered his profession, can truly say with Cicero, 'Integra nobis est judicandi potestas; neque ut omnia quæ præscripta et quasi imperata sunt, defendamus, necessitate ulla cogimur'?* Nay, rather, of which one among them may it not far more truly be said, 'Infirmissimo tempore relatis, de rebus incognitis judicat, et ad quamcunque disciplinam, quasi tempestate delatus ad eam tanquam ad saxum adhærescit'? †

"With all such persons, therefore, any attempt at religious conversation or discussion, with a view to mutual improvement and the single-minded interchange of truth, must be a visionary and hopeless thing. But do I erroneously believe that far different must be the case when a mind, disgusted with the imposition of intolerant and complicated creeds and articles, and at length resolved—*coute qu'il coute*—to think for itself, chances upon intercourse with another mind, even far more painfully wounded and not less resolutely bent upon exercising its rare endowments in the prosecution of the noblest of all subjects of inquiry—religious truth?

"Both you, Sir, and I have been repelled from the creeds of our youth. And fortunately for the hopes I have formed, in one other particular there is a circumstance we partake of in common. In 'casting away the cords from us' of one form of bondage, we have not entangled ourselves with those of another. The temptations of interest, for you as for me, have lost their power to impede our march. And though your lot is apparently cast among those (estimable and honoured as they are) whose condition is comparatively one of restraint, yet you appear to me to have too strongly evinced the temper of your mind, and too ardently breathed the passion for intellectual independence that sways it, for any danger to assail you from such a contact, or for any ecclesiastical *system* whatever to claim you for its own.

"May I then rejoice in regarding you as one (almost the only one I have met with in life) who, full of information, is ready to impart it—full of candour, is ready to extend it—exempted from every secular bias, and furnished with all heavenward affections, so far as the frailty of our nature will admit, puts nothing in competition with truth, and only values truth itself for the

---

* We have a full and perfect power of judging for ourselves, nor are we under any necessity of defending every opinion that has come down to us, as if it were authoritatively prescribed and enjoined.

† At the most inexperienced period of their lives, they presume to determine upon matters completely unknown to them; and to whatever system, as if at the mercy of a tempest, they happen originally to be carried, to that, as it were to a rock, they ever after tenaciously adhere.

happiness and holiness it conduces to bring us while here, and as fitting our souls for a fuller, freer, purer communion with the everlasting Fountain and Father of Truth, when, by his mercy in Jesus Christ, we shall have been 'translated into the kingdom of his dear Son'?

"I feel anxious to observe that, in more than one communication with which I have been favoured by you, I have found cause for surprise at the certainty with which you have assumed that my sentiments were those of decided Unitarianism. In the course of the very little that I have ventured to publish, I can hardly think I have expressed—certainly I nowhere intended—a sentiment which could be strictly construed to bear that sense. My single object throughout has been to defend such sentiments, in reference to the ecclesiastical complexion of my own times, as had already brought down with honour to posterity the immortal names of Chillingworth, Jeremy Taylor and Locke.

"It was at no time my object to controvert opinions, but only the *spirit* in which opinions were maintained by churches, sects and parties, and by none with more distinguished intolerance of pretension, or pretensions to intolerance, than the Church by law established in these countries. Every where and always, indeed, I have claimed for Unitarians the title of Christian; since otherwise the world would have to unchristianize such men as Milton, Lardner and Price; and I could see no interval between such a proceeding and the nearest route to Rome. But nowhere that I can recollect have I designated myself, or left it by unavoidable implication for others to designate me, by the title of Unitarian.

"If, indeed, the advocacy of such views as I have espoused constitute a Unitarian, then, in common with every Protestant who argues consistently from his own principles, I could not have shrunk from a name which would only have been synonymous with that of Protestant. But until this identity was no longer to be questioned, I must take leave to suggest that the fixing upon me of the name of Unitarian was not logically warranted, and was consequently premature.

"Nevertheless, *now* that a fitting opportunity invites the declaration (although, as a free inquirer into Christian truth, I could wish it were possible to avoid the *fixity* of any particular name), I have no hesitation in avowing to you, that from the doctrine of the Trinity, as defined and maintained in the articles and formularies of the Church of England, I do, in my present position of mind, *most completely recoil.* In reference, however, to the preceding remarks, I will own to you, I am not unprepared to concede that the advocacy of free and fearless inquiry in matters of religion does—it did so certainly with me—strongly dispose to a favourable consideration of the most comprehensive, that is to say the most simple, form in which Christianity can

present itself; and this I believe is that form to which the name of Unitarian is commonly affixed. If to claim for Unitarianism the character of Christian, import that Christianity may consist with that form of belief,—and if *to be Christian* imply a desire to be governed by the laws, to cultivate the hopes, and to profit by the aids, which Christ, on the authority of God, has promulged,—it seems difficult to understand why that system (call it what you will) which, rejecting all other additions, *comprehends these several requisites*, should not be entitled to the acceptance—nay, to the open *preference*—of every rational and sober mind.

"Much did I rejoice to find this truth emphatically declared in various passages and in various phrase in the course of your interesting 'Travels.' I allude especially to pp. 73, 74 and 130, in your second volume. Now if, in the former, it be true that the particulars you there set forth must constitute '*that faith* which Christ demands in his disciples;' and if, in the latter, it be no less truly declared of matter substantially the same, that 'this *and nothing else* is *pure* Christianity,'—I protest I am utterly unable to discern, not alone wherein can consist the value, but what effort of ingenuity can sustain the credibility of any other *additions* whatsoever. An expression occurs at pp. 137, 138 of Vol. I., in the propriety of which I so entirely concur, that my only wonder is how men of thought can ever have suffered their minds to wander into systems so much the opposite of that to which their understanding and their heart inevitably revert, the instant the pressure of *controversy* is withdrawn, or whenever the habitual submission which education and society impose happens for a moment to be eluded. The expression I refer to is this—'The *extreme simplicity and reasonableness*' of Christianity. I acknowledge both the one and the other; and were it not for these, I candidly own to you, I could not be a Christian. Seeing, then, the marked precision with which, in so many instances, you speak of rational Christianity—observing, too, with admiration, the reach of mind and the cultivated powers you bring to the investigation of religion, I can the less account for certain other expressions which escape you, and for the general conclusions on the subject in which you seem to have hitherto rested. One or two instances of these I will now take the liberty of selecting.

"The first shall be one which arrested my attention so long ago as eight years. It occurs in the commencing letter of your masterly 'Evidence against Catholicism,' where you say that 'in length of time, Christianity in the light of Unitarianism appeared to me a mighty work to little purpose.' On reading these words, I immediately took down the volume of Paley's Moral Philosophy containing the celebrated chapter on 'Reverencing the Deity,' at the conclusion of which the following

sublime and affecting passage convinced me that there was no real foundation for the conclusion at which you had arrived:—'There is a class of reasoners who can see *little* in Christianity, even supposing it to be true. To such adversaries we address this reflection: Had Jesus Christ delivered no other declaration than the following—'The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the grave shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of condemnation'—he had pronounced a message of inestimable importance, and *well worthy of that splendid apparatus of prophecy and miracles* with which his mission was introduced and attested; a message in which the wisest of mankind would rejoice to find an answer to their doubts and rest to their inquiries,' &c. &c.

"I felt then, and still feel, my dear Sir, that this 'answer' and this 'rest,' in all their force and blessedness, belong to the creed of the Unitarian; and it did indeed seem inexplicable why it was that you could have 'lost all hope,' as you express it, of thereby 'quieting your mind.' To any person less strongly impressed than you with the 'extreme simplicity and reasonableness' of Christianity, I could have easily understood how a doctrine so entirely divested of mystery, so directly 'coming home to the business and the bosoms' of mankind, might have appeared comparatively unattractive and uninteresting; and I know not how we could more forcibly or happily picture the appetite of believers in general for exaggeration and complexity, than in the following words of Professor Brown, which I have long noted down as singularly applicable to the subject in hand: 'Such is the strange nature of man,' says that profound writer, 'that the simplicity of truth, which might seem to be its essential charm, and which renders it doubly valuable in relation to the weakness of his faculties, is the very circumstance that renders it least attractive to him; and though, in his analysis of everything that is compound in matter or involved in thought, he constantly flatters himself that it is this very simplicity which he loves and seeks, he yet, when he arrives at absolute simplicity, feels an equal tendency to turn away from it, and gladly prefers to it anything that is more mysterious, merely because it is mysterious. I am persuaded, said one who knew our nature well,* that if the majority of mankind could be made to see the order of the universe such as it is, as they would not remark in it any virtues attached to certain numbers, nor any properties inherent in certain planets, nor fatalities in certain times and revolutions of these, they would not be able to restrain themselves, on the sight of this admirable regularity and beauty, from crying out with astonishment, *What! is this all?*'

* Fontenelle.

"Forgive me for saying that, when I place this passage in juxtaposition with the conclusion in your volume to which I have referred, I see a parallelism in the cases which contributes not a little to relieve me from any misgiving I might have felt as to the soundness of the views in which my own meditations have resulted.

"You probably remember the humorous illustration of Selden in describing the same fact:—'We love a man that damns us, and we run after him again to save us. If a man had a sore leg, and he should go to an honest, judicious chirurgeon, and he should only bid him to keep it warm and anoint with such an oil, an oil well known, that would do the cure, haply he would not much regard him, because he knows the medicine beforehand an ordinary medicine. But if he should go to a surgeon that would tell him, Your leg will gangrene within three days, and it must be cut off, and you will die unless you do something that I could tell you,—what listening there would be to this man!' &c.

"Assuredly, I would not be thought to trifle on so momentous a subject, or to undervalue the anxiety with which any human being should apply himself, on grounds of probability satisfactory to himself, to the cure of the spiritual pangs under which he may be languishing. But when a remedy is offered and *rejected*,—more especially when principles are upheld which had seemed to invite the application and anticipate the efficiency of the remedy so rejected,—some indulgence may be hoped for the curiosity which seeks an explanation of the fact, and some sympathy awakened towards a mind whose hopes and convictions, it had thought, were solidly founded on principles which yet would appear to be the basis of such opposite conclusions!

"In your letter of May 1st, which I shall ever value for its eloquent and touching expression of all that is essential and precious in the Christian faith, you have prayed for the day to come, 'when, whatever may be the difference of what may be called the *technical* language of theology, all who believe in God, the Father of Christ, all who love God in Christ, all who trust for life and eternity in God through Christ, will recognize each other as heirs of salvation.' Oh! Sir, these are indeed the words of eternal truth! But how, alas! are we ever to hope for this day, when even men of pure and upright souls and exalted intellects—men who, walking themselves in light, must know the influence which language has over the ideas of the many—nevertheless contribute the sanction of their example in retaining this language, and in thereby protracting to a hopeless distance the day when men, forgetting the unessentials in which they had been taught to differ, and abjuring the divisions into which a vicious use of language had betrayed them, might at length begin to see and pursue the things which truly belong to their peace?

"Vainly, indeed, do we hope,—idly, alas! do we pray, for the creed-ridden multitude to forbear from uncharitable judgments, and to discern the absurdity no less than the mischief of attaching importance to the barbarous niceties and theological freaks of *orthodox* emperors, popes and fathers—and you have well shewn what sort of a thing this *orthodoxy* was—when so luminous and revered a guide as the present Metropolitan of Dublin has not been *shocked* at giving the dignity of his name and the implication of his approval to such a document as the pseudo-Athanasian Creed, or even to the weekly recital of the less odious, indeed, but scarcely more intelligible or edifying, dogmas of the gentle Fathers of Nice!

"But there is an expression in your letter, which, as it has reference to yourself, I am much more interested in clearly understanding—I mean the words, '*the side to which I belong.*' Now really, if I might judge from the character of your remarks, as well in your letter to me, as more fully still in your printed works, 'the side' on which I should expect to find you would be *that* which *least departs*, instead of that which deviates most, from the just and excellent principles you lay down. Remember, I pray you, that 'the side' to which you lead me to infer 'you belong,' will not acknowledge what *you* truly declare to be '*that faith* which Christ demands of his disciples,' to be any such thing. Be it ever so 'sincere,' it is not the right faith, it is not a saving faith, unless it include a belief in three separate Persons, *each by itself* true and perfect God. Remember, I entreat, that 'the side' to which you would seem to 'belong,' will not hear of that mutilated faith of which you affirm — incontrovertibly in my opinion—that such, 'and *nothing else*, is pure Christianity.' Oh no! they require you to say that, though the Son is *of the Father*, while the Father is *of none;* yet in this aforenamed triad, 'none is afore or after other, none is greater or less than another;' and that unless you acknowledge all this, 'without doubt you shall perish everlastingly,'—or, as it is equivalently phrased at the conclusion of the horrible formula referred to, you are doomed to *everlasting fire.*

"So much for the side to which you 'belong.' Now let us weigh in the opposite scale the sentiments which prevail, and the 'definitions' which are received, on the side to which I am to suppose you do *not* belong. In the first place, then, if it be correct to say that the faith which you have described is 'that which Christ demands of his disciples,'—and that such, and 'nothing else, is pure Christianity,'—I am warranted in contending that no other known sect in Christendom so closely approaches to your own acceptation of Christianity as do the Unitarians. In every one of those beautiful and soul-moving sentiments you express, I believe I can affirm safely that every Unitarian breathing could cordially and joyously concur. Is this nothing in

their favour? But further, is it nothing that, seeing with you the 'extreme simplicity and reasonableness' of Christianity,—or similarly seeing, with Jeremy Taylor, that 'those creeds are best which keep to the very words of Scripture, and that faith the best which has most simplicity,'—they decline to encumber their faith with human expositions, giving a reason of the hope that is in them in the identical words of Holy Writ, and maintaining at once the supremacy of Scripture and the liberty of inquiry by forbearing to impose, as tests of Christianity, the *deductions* of one age or the implicit acquiescence of another?

"But I must not forget that you object to Unitarianism the *definiteness* of its denials on the one hand, and of its *assertions* on the other. Now I ask, with all possible humility and self-distrust, is it too much of definiteness of denial to say in reference to the God and Father of Jesus Christ, 'This is life eternal, to know *Thee, the only* true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent'? Or again, that 'To us there is but one God, *the Father;* and one Lord, Jesus Christ'? If, upon intimations so *express* as these, we are led into the error of denying that, to any other being or portion of a being in the universe, save and except the Father alone, can the appellation of God, in its highest and most absolute sense, be lawfully given, at least we might hope that the *negation* which contents itself with 'the very words of Scripture' would escape the imputation of *over-assurance.* And now one word for our definiteness of *assertion.*

"It is indeed true, we have a notion that, ever since the promulgation of the gospel, were Christians only a little less bent upon puzzling themselves, they might without much difficulty know '*what* it is they worship.' To us the case seems amazingly simple. For example: the Being whom the Athenians had ignorantly worshiped, St. Paul, in a manner the most unequivocal, undertook to 'declare to them.' Now it was this *same* Being, whom Paul *after,* as well as before his conversion, continued to worship as the one unchangeable 'God of his (Jewish) fathers.' While, in fine, the peculiar title of that God, and the relation in which He stood to Jesus Christ, is further ascertained by the words of our Lord himself—'It is my *Father*—of whom ye say that He is your God.' By the infinite goodness of God, then, we do say, however it may be with others, that Unitarians 'know what and whom they worship,' acknowledging with all 'definiteness of assertion' one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and *Father* of all, *who is above all,* and through all, and in us all, and in their literal acceptation of these words, consistently maintaining—arbitrary punctuation apart—that Romans ix. 5 must be construed by this in Ephesians, and not this by Rom. ix. 5.

"With a force irresistible by everything but the inveterate prejudice of a mind destroyed by education, you have demonstrated the absurdity of supposing that any additions to the

simple Christianity of the Scriptures can add to the *safety* of the believer; and that, having arrived at the safe, it is preposterous to trouble ourselves about the *safer*. Nothing can be more true than this. You then go on to say, 'I know that prayer to God through Christ is *safe*.' And here, again, there can be no difference of opinion. I wish, dear Sir, I could go on to approve; but, alas! I fear you next proceed in search of the *safer;* for I find you next observing, 'I know that to consider Christ as the true and living image of the Father, and to *worship him* as such, is safe.' Now, taking this term, as before, to import religious adoration, is this, I pray you to consider, *quite* so safe as is here assumed?

"'It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, *and him only*—not his image, but himself—shalt thou serve.' 'After this manner pray ye, *Our Father*, who art in heaven.' 'The hour cometh when the true worshipers shall worship'—whom? The Son? No. The Holy Ghost? No. Both these inclusive? No such thing; but the *true* worshipers shall worship the *Father*. 'In that day ye shall ask me nothing; whatsoever ye shall ask the *Father* in my name, he will give it to you.' 'Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the *Father* in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. And whatsoever ye do, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the *Father* by him.' Are not these explicit directions for prayer? Will it not be *safe* to comply with them? And shall we be warranted in concluding that we should be *safer* still in the belief that there are blessings which the Father, thus addressed, either will not or cannot grant; and that some object of prayer, other than the Father, or supplementary to him, is requisite to supply us with those things which he is wanting either in the power or the will to bestow? Never can I think of these things without being lost in astonishment at how much the Christian world has yet to learn, or rather to *unlearn*. If, however, it be said—for what will not orthodoxy in its shifts be tempted to say?—that God the Son is addressed as a being the *same* with God the Father, then—waiving the rather curious question how he can *actually be the same* with that God and Father at whose right hand he is represented as sitting—we ask, why use a name which either imports a *difference*, or degenerates into a word without an idea?

"Besides, where all this time is that portion of devotion which ought to be allotted to the third Person of the Trinity? I believe, in the entire Liturgy of the Church of England, there is but one solitary direct address to the Holy Ghost, and that in a mere versicle at the commencement of the Litany. Is this a fair apportionment? Or does it argue that the common sense even of the half-reformed compilers of our Liturgy revolted at the thought of presenting to the attention of worshipers this supernumerary claimant to their homage so often as the consistency

of their doctrine would have required? In the adjustment of the devotions to the other two Persons, doubtless there was found to be sufficient perplexity, without the superadded distraction *of a third*,—a circumstance which may easily be believed by any one who observes the very arbitrary distribution which obtains in the several divisions of our public devotional service. With scarcely an exception, the whole of the morning and evening prayer is directed to *the Father alone:* take, for example, the form of confession in each. Now are these *imperfect* forms of prayer? or were their deficiencies designed to be *made up* by the exuberant devotion to the Son—in his character, too, of a human being—witness the lavish allusions, in such exquisitely Popish taste, to his bodily sufferings on the cross—in that totally distinct service, the Litany? These, dear Sir, are serious questions, and might make one pause in admitting the wisdom or the scriptural influence that prevailed in the arrangement and conception—doctrinally regarded—of these strange compositions.

"For my own part, I never can think of the doctrine to which these observations apply, without thinking too of the detestable ages in which it grew and strengthened. I see the darkest passions of the darkest era in the history of man arrayed in its construction; I trace its progress to maturity through scenes at which memory sickens; and I mark the reluctant spirit with which the mitigated bigotry of an era comparatively enlightened, resigns the victim it may no longer lay its guilty hands on. Concurrently with this, or rather in proportion as we recede from the period when a scowling priesthood sat like an incubus on the soul of man, I see too the efforts of the mind, whenever it could baffle this dreaded power, to soar into its native light, and embrace a system of belief 'in harmony,' as the admirable Channing would express it, 'with the whole of our inward nature,'—a system in which the intellect and the affections can look with equal favour, and which, without shocking the reason, can stimulate and sustain our purest aspirations after the world of spirits. In a word, exactly in proportion as circumstances have favoured the free development of mind, whether in respect to individuals or communities, I have observed from the earliest period of the Reformation down to the present time, in America as in Europe, a disposition to revert to and maintain 'the simplicity and reasonableness of Christianity' in that perfection which, in tones of such deep and genuine piety, you justly and feelingly ascribe to it.

"I know not whether to wish that this letter had been one with less of controversy. At any rate, on looking over the several communications with which you have honoured me, and recollecting, so far as I can, the tenor of mine to you, I feel that I have not invited, while I no less feel that I ought not to have declined, the discussion into which I trust I have not been

offensively betrayed. Much indeed should I be mortified, were the effect of anything I have written here to be other than a desire in you to reciprocate the offer of a calm and kindly interchange of opinion on a subject of surpassing interest, but which has so rarely the fortune to be treated either with the temper suitable to its nature or the freedom befitting intelligent beings. I have already given expression to my sense of your peculiar adaptation to the office of cultivating and expounding religious truth. I can well understand the distinction, so happily pointed out by Archbishop Whately, between 'wishing to have truth on our side, and to be on the side of truth.' The latter, I am persuaded, is the condition of your mind; with the unusual advantage besides of having already overleaped the limits of your educational belief, without exposing yourself to the bias from secular interest which in so many instances must unconsciously influence the conclusions of others. Yet I will not pretend that there are not some important particulars, independently of those I have noticed in this letter, upon which my mind would gladly avail itself of further light, or has even taken up impressions not quite in unison with yours. It is the faculty of all vigorous minds to throw out materials by which other minds are sure to improve, whether they embrace or reject the conclusions into which those materials are moulded. My experience of this fact has not been weakened by my acquaintance with your valuable labours. But while I have hesitated as to some of the views you have either directly or incidentally defended, I willingly acknowledge that the information, the sentiment and the genius, with which your pages abound, have commanded for the far greater part, not alone my unreluctant assent, but my grateful and lasting admiration.

"With such a mind I own I should not lightly prize the privilege of holding intercourse. Yet, however inferior in power, conscious as I am of the equal integrity and the not unlike vicissitudes of my own, I may perhaps be permitted to hope that the pleasure and advantage might not altogether be confined to me.

"I have for some time been residing in the family of my brother; but although I have at present no house of my own, yet I have so far a *home*, that I can with pleasure assure you of a respectful and hearty greeting, if I might venture to solicit, and should be so fortunate as to obtain, from you the favour of your personal presence among us for a few days. We are in the neighbourhood here of some interesting and charming scenes—not being very far from the banks of the Boyne—to which it would indeed rejoice me to have the opportunity of being your guide; and being only twenty miles from town, I almost allow myself to anticipate the kindness of your favourable reply.

"In the meantime and always, believe me to be," &c.

Mr. Blanco White's two acknowledgments of this letter will be found in his Life, Vol. II. pp. 48, 49. He excuses himself, "on account of the difficulty of getting a frank, and still more the state of his health," from giving a detailed answer to all the observations which might seem to require it. "I must content myself," he adds, "with giving this proof that your letter has deeply engaged my attention." As the letters have been published and are so easily accessible, it is not necessary to quote them here; but the concluding observations of the second being more particularly referred to in Mr. Armstrong's answer which is to follow, it may be convenient to extract them:

"I believe that, if I were twenty years younger, I should be very much inclined to open a chapel of my own, and avoid the giving it any *denomination* besides that of *Christian*. . . . . Whatever powers are left me, I am, however, determined to employ in writing against the spirit of orthodoxy—that bane of the Christian Church, which began to corrupt it almost in the times of the apostles themselves. I cannot conclude without suggesting to you how desirable it would be that the ministers of the gospel called Unitarians should avoid *dogmatism*, or positive doctrines about the *mere humanity* of Christ, leaving the subject in the state in which it is unquestionably found in the Scriptures. I say *unquestionably*, though I imply a doubt which many Unitarians do not entertain, because it cannot be denied that to settle the question of the *nature* of Christ by setting texts against texts, is utterly impracticable in regard to the mass of Christians. That Providence intended to leave the subject in that undefinable state, is to me a *fact* proved by the *balancing* tendency, if I may use the expression, which I observe in the New Testament. Why should we not leave it so? There is another point of the utmost importance to the progress of truly *liberal* Christian theology,—the acquiescence of Unitarians in the practice of worshiping the one God in Christ. This I conceive to be independent of the metaphysical question of the two natures. To me it is enough to hear Christ say that men should worship him as they worshiped the Father, and that he and his Father are one. I say that this is enough to justify the practice of addressing ourselves to God incarnate—by which I understand God united with Christ *in regard to us*, without defining the manner of the union. If to do this were unchristian, I cannot conceive that the Scriptures of the New Testament would leave such an opening to the practice. . . . . .

"With earnest prayer for light from above to you and to me, and in the spirit of Christian fellowship, I remain, my dear Sir, very sincerely yours,

J. Blanco White."

"*To the Rev. J. Blanco White, Archbishop of Dublin's, Stephen's Green.*

"Kilsharvan, Drogheda, Nov. 25—Dec. 1, 1834.

"My dear Sir,—At length, for very shame, I proceed to inform you that your truly acceptable and valuable letter of the 31st August arrived here during my absence from home; and much indeed do I wish that a far less interval had elapsed before I could conveniently apply myself to its consideration with the care it so deservedly required. Believe me, however, that I now avail myself of the earliest leisure I have had for rendering it such justice as my humble capability will admit, and for requesting your friendly and candid reception of the reflections it has given rise to in my mind.

"I may briefly premise that to the term 'Unitarian,' as applied to myself, I could at no time, since the change of my opinions, have the slightest objection—no more, indeed, than I could have to be called, at Constantinople, a Christian, even with the complimentary appendage of 'dog' annexed to it. And I must declare that so far as a *reproach* should be intended, my respect for the person so applying the term 'Unitarian' would be not one whit more than for the poor unthinking utterer of the *orthodox slang* in fashion with the believers of the Prophet. The single dissatisfaction I designed to express in anything I may have conveyed to you was, that a work which aimed to be the common friend of all creeds, by preparing for each and all—more especially for such as were least in popular favour—an unprejudiced hearing, should be regarded, beyond this simple claim for a *hearing*, as Unitarian in its character, and consequently as a work which the orthodox, so to call them, were to view with suspicion, and the bigoted to pass by in alarm. But enough of this.

"I rejoice, however little I am surprised, that you have acquired so perfect an insight into the spirit of the ecclesiastical sayings and doings at present in so peculiar a state of activity as well in England as in Ireland. There is a passage in Hallam's History of England, reign of Anne, which I often refer to as marvellously descriptive of the majority of the order in our own day. 'The clergy,' he says, 'in very many instances were a curse rather than a blessing to those over whom they were set; and the people, while they trusted that from these polluted fountains they could draw the living waters of truth, became the dupes of *factious lies and sophistries*.' It may be thought perhaps to be somewhat unfair to aim with so sweeping an application a censure which was only designed for the particular vices of a particular period. But, I must own, the difficulty to me is to find the period when the clergy, as a body, have *not* been 'a curse rather than a blessing to those over whom they were set;' and assuredly the difficulty is but slightly diminished on taking a review of their character as exhibited in these our own days.

In short, I must frankly declare that in reference to that imposing majority, whether within or without the Establishment, who take to themselves the title of orthodox, I know of no other body of men in society to whom with so perfect propriety the epithets of hateful and mischievous can apply as to them. As an order of men professedly engaged in the prosecution of truth, the profligate disregard they evince to the *method* and temper in which alone truth can be successfully sought, and the vicious and unchristian spirit they manifest towards those who seek it in any other path but their own, expose them, in my humble judgment, to the charge of propagating and *loving falsehood*, in a degree incomparably beyond that of any other class of men in the history of the world.

"Feeling, then, as I do—believing that they have done more to 'set kingdom against kingdom, neighbour against neighbour, family against family, and man against man,'—and that they are at this moment opposing greater obstacles to the progress and expansion of the human mind than all other causes put together, I am only consistent when I say that, Quaker-like, I incline to believe we should be infinite gainers were there no such profession in existence. The fact is, that in a free and civilized and generally educated community, it may reasonably be argued that a clergy *have no mission* to teach the truth. The truth is already at every man's door, and he has only to stoop to lift it up; but if he wait for a gentleman in black, and with a university or episcopal licence, to tell him what truth is, the chances are ten to one he loses sight of truth altogether, and gets in its place some scheme handed down cut and dry from antiquity, and endorsed by the authority of the age, country or locality, in which the deluded inquirer may happen to be.

"When did a clergy ever forward the interests of truth? Never—and for this plain reason, that it is not truth, but *creeds*, they are concerned in sustaining. That is to say, although we disdain to abide by the chemistry, the astronomy, the jurisprudence, or the constitutional maxims of bygone days, yet in *theology*, as if it were of inferior importance to any of these, we set up a corporation of men notoriously *pledged* from the first dawn of their manhood, by their hopes of subsistence and advancement in the world, to see neither beyond nor beside—but to preach, to write and to scold in behalf of—the precise and particular number of dogmas which emanated from the half-emancipated intellects of certain old gentlemen in the 16th century! And here the eloquent words of the honoured Channing so forcibly suggest themselves, that I cannot forbear to advert to them. 'I see, indeed, superior minds and great minds among the adherents of the prevalent system; but they seem to me to move in chains, and to fulfil poorly their high function of adding to the wealth of the human intellect. In theological discussion, they

remind me more of Samson grinding in the narrow mill of the Philistines, than of that undaunted champion achieving victories for God's people and enlarging the bounds of their inheritance.

"But after all, as I can very well imagine a clergy without an array of transmitted opinions imposed upon their acceptance, and through them recommended to the uninquiring acceptance of others, I could be well pleased to see such an order of men dispersed through society, who, by their leisure, their eloquence, their amiable bearing and their pure affections, should be able to draw men's minds from earth to heaven, and, professing less to be teachers of truth than preachers and examples of practical goodness, should ever be ready to aid in the inquiries of their brethren, casting away all pretension to dominion over their faith, and, in the work of interpreting God's revelations, contented to be helpers of their joy and fellow-seekers after knowledge, rather than a weight upon their souls and a hindrance to their path.

"Should it gratify me the less to behold such a system, that it would afford a promise of the extension of opinions, in whose train alone I can see the true happiness of society, the solid improvement of man, and a stability and wide-spreading growth for Christianity, for which the missions of orthodoxy have hitherto but dubiously provided either abroad or at home? I need not say to *you*, that wherever the incredible, the mysterious and the startling is most in vogue, *there* the reaction in favour of unbelief is of proportionate energy. The country of your birth is testimony of this, and I can confidently assure you that the country of your adoption abounds in examples of the analogous fact. I say the analogous fact, because I am not alluding to any effects upon the thinking mind from the existence of Popery—strictly such—in these countries. With *that* Popery, indeed, the intelligent and educated classes of Britain have no sympathy; but there is another Popery—a blind, unexamining, anti-rational adhesion to creeds, which are scarcely, if at all, less shocking than Popery itself to understandings of the slightest capacity or taste for steady, persevering and independent thought. And just in proportion to the prevalence and popularity of these creeds in reference to one class of minds, is the progress of deep, subtle, sneering, total unbelief—less often avowed than betrayed—in others. This I well know, for I have personal experience of it; and there is indeed no fact of which I am more entirely persuaded, than that which has been expressed in the following words by Mr. Buckminster, a young American divine, who, too soon for the world, but not too soon for the happy immortality into which he was to pass, was cut off in the midst of a power and promise of which the records of genius and piety have but few examples. 'Nothing,' says that interesting writer, 'so much tends to multiply hypocrites and infidels as the mysterious suppression or discouragement of all attempts to make religion intelligible.

It may be set down as a maxim, that all the advantages which may at any time appear to be gained by making religion a passion and faith an unenlightened principle, are completely counterbalanced by the inevitable increase of hypocrisy, infidelity and bigotry, with which such a state of things is attended.

"As there is nothing true, striking or admirable, connected with religion, which has not been said by Channing in a manner in which no other man could say it, you will pardon me, I know, for again introducing him, for the sake of his awakening admonitions on the same subject:

"'At the present day, one of the most urgent duties of the friends of Christianity, is to rescue it from the reproach of waging war with reason. The character of our age demands this; there have been times when Christianity, though loaded with unreasonable doctrines, retained its hold on men's faith; for men had not learned to think. But that day is gone by, and the spirit of freedom which has succeeded it, is subjecting Christianity to a scrutiny more and more severe; and if this religion cannot vindicate itself to the reflecting, the calm, the wise, as a reasonable service, it cannot stand. Fanatical sects may for a time spread an intolerant excitement through a community, and impose silence on the objections of the sceptical. But fanaticism is the epidemic of a season; it wastes itself by its own violence; sooner or later the voice of reflection will be heard. Men will ask, What are the claims of Christianity? Does it bear the marks of truth? And if it be found to war with nature and reason, it will be, and it ought to be, abandoned. On this ground, I am anxious that Christianity should be cleared from all human additions and corruptions. If indeed irrational doctrines belong to it, then I have no desire to separate them from it. I have no desire, for the sake of upholding the gospel, to wrap up and conceal, much less to deny, any of its real principles. Did I think it was burdened with one irrational doctrine, I would say so, and I would leave it, as I found it, with this millstone round its neck. But I know none such. I meet, indeed, some difficulties in the narrative part of the New Testament; and there are arguments in the Epistles which, however suited to the Jews to whom they were addressed, are not apparently adapted to men at large; but I see not a principle of the religion which my reason, calmly and impartially exercised, pronounces inconsistent with any great truth. I have the strongest conviction that Christianity is *reason in its most perfect form;* and therefore I plead for its disengagement from the irrational additions with which it has been clogged for ages.'

"Entirely, earnestly, passionately, do my heart and soul respond to these thoughts; and firmly do I believe that, without such efforts as the inestimable writer I have quoted suggests, in that concussion of opinions and shock of institutions which, it

may be, the present, but assuredly the next generation is destined to witness over no small portion of the civilized earth, Christianity will be evil-entreated and denounced as a contributing cause of the degradation, oppression and cozening of the human race. But—I bless God for it!—these efforts are making.

"Within the last hundred years, independently of the earlier *heresy* of Poland, which has since found a flourishing home in Transylvania, a Reformation within a Reformation has begun; and in the two most remarkable cities in the world for the growth and culture of the direful system of Calvin—Boston in America and Geneva in Europe—singularly enough, too, the latter at the instance of our own Bishop Burnet—by the simple disuse of creeds, and the leaving of the clergy and laity to long familiarity with the silent, unperverted, *unarticled* teaching of Scripture itself, men's minds have happily emerged into a system of mercy, of reason and of freedom, which speaks cheeringly of the destined progress of the race in the same path.

"Let us do what we can, dear Sir, to hasten this progress, and to mingle our names in the honourable strife by which it is to be accomplished. You speak of an inclination, were you twenty years younger, to open a chapel of your own, to which you would give no other name but that of 'Christian.' I would to God your health and age were such, on the one hand, and our identity of sentiment so complete on the other, that I could offer to join myself heart and hand with you in such an enterprize! But I fear that, even were all things else to favour, some lingering incompatibility of opinion, however sincere our mutual desire to remove it, might still remain to render such a union of less easy attainment than we could wish.

"Referring now to the few observations which I find at the close of your last letter—and certainly it is full time to do so—I am not sure that I quite apprehend what you mean by the impracticability of settling the question as to the nature of Christ, especially, as you say, with regard to the mass of Christians, by setting 'text against text.' Perhaps I am to understand that the weight of merely textual evidence is *so even* on both sides as to render a decision by this means hopeless; and that thence it is you are struck by the 'balancing tendency' which Scripture appears to you to present on this great question.

"Now were I to grant—which indeed I do not—that any such 'balancing' *is* observable, I am at a loss to perceive why I am precluded, or why any human being is precluded, from seeking *for further light* beyond the limits of Scripture itself. Roman Catholics, you know, are accustomed to say that, in controverted questions, the Scriptures are mute and cannot decide—In quibus incerta est victoria, aut par incertæ;—and accordingly they betake themselves to the resource of an *infallible interpreter*.

But though Protestants professedly reject this expedient, they are not the less bound to look for some other. Let us then suppose, as Paley, embracing the concession of his adversary Hume, has observed with regard to the evidences of Christianity, —that it is 'a contest of opposite improbabilities;' that is to say, that it is improbable, from the evidence of Scripture, that a plurality of persons in the Godhead should exist, and *equally* improbable that it should *not* exist; let such be admitted to be the state of the case—and what then? Are we to let the matter rest there? that is to say, come to no conclusion at all?—or, with the instinctive but misdirected impulse of the Romanist, look about for some extrinsic and independent considerations which might enable us to turn the scale? It is thus that Paley has sought, and successfully, to establish the antecedent probability, or at least the credibility, of miracles; and precisely by the same process I can see with the most perfect distinctness that—even were the testimony of Scripture with regard to the nature of the Godhead as equiponderant as you state it to be—the light which is available from *other* sources, and the antecedent probabilities which present themselves, are abundantly sufficient to destroy the balance.

"Setting aside the innumerable absurdities, which have prevailed in all ages of the world, upon the nature and attributes of God, solely because men have *not* reasoned, or else have not reasoned sufficiently *far*,—what, let us ask, is the first conviction of a thinking mind, in this more cultivated age of the world, on turning its thought to the Deity? Why, plainly and palpably, the supremacy of that Being. There can be nothing else above him, or equal to him, in the universe; nec quidquam viget simile aut secundum; for otherwise it would have depended upon a mere chance whether there were order or confusion, collision or concurrence, in the works of creation! 'Gods many or lords many,' *one* must be *supreme*, if the impossibility of *counteraction* from any independent and co-ordinate will were a necessary condition to a creation of wisdom and order.

"Nor must it be forgotten—pardon me for writing thus to such a master in Israel as you—that were there *any other being* of equal power, neither of them could be infinite; for there cannot be two infinites; infinity in either must exclude it in the other. Added to which, since of two independent and equal beings we might conceive either of them to exist *alone*, and since therefore it would be no contradiction to imagine the other *not to exist*, it would result that neither of them would be necessarily existent! And here we are in the jaws of Atheism—thanks to orthodoxy for bringing us there. But having no taste for the process by which such extremes meet, my heresy is content to tread a safer path, and with not a little wonder asks, having

supremacy, infinity, and a necessarily existent, intelligent First Cause, by what *possibility* could the notion of *plurality* ever find its way into our conclusion?

"The truth is, considered in whatever point of view, we inevitably arrive at *unity*,—unity of essence, unity of power, unity of will; and of which unity we can have no other conception than such as we form when we ascribe it to ourselves or others. God is one precisely in the same sense that you or I are one; for if Scripture do not use language in the same sense that men use it, it speaks *in an unknown tongue*. There is a contemptible illustration employed in the Athanasian Creed, vastly convincing no doubt to the pious and passive believers who occasionally rejoice in its recital, that 'as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, *so* 'God and man is one Christ.' Unluckily it was forgotten in this brilliant attempt *to explain*, that the 'flesh' of our nature, as contradistinguished from its spiritual adjunct, does not think and act; whereas in the supposed duality of nature residing in Christ—for such is the corollary doctrine of the tri-personality of the Deity—each constituent, the man as well as the God, must think and act in its own appropriate manner.

"When we speak, then, of God being one, it must be as we understand the term one when applied to ourselves; which term one excludes from all share in our intelligent being—however numerous our *functions* may happen to be—everything but one sole, individual person or *conscious agent*. Nor will orthodoxy, as it appears to me, gain the slightest advantage, as contemplated by Archbishop Whately—see his Logic, art. Person—from the nominalism of Wallis, any more than from the realism of Sherlock. For even were we to substitute 'manifestation' for person, and conceive of the Deity as revealing himself in a three-fold 'capacity,' rather than in a three-fold personality, there would still remain the incongruity—may I say the absurdity?—of supposing one of the capacities addressing itself and praying to another—one of them as sending, another as sent—and all as sustaining the functions of so many independent living, thinking, conscious beings. Just as if a Lord Chancellor of England, at once a Judge, a Speaker, and a Cabinet Minister, could be imagined in his character of Speaker to address himself to his other character of Judge; or that as Cabinet Minister he should be an emanation from the united volition and power of his other two capacities, and thereupon hold intercourse with these,—while yet he should operate, as some third intelligent 'somewhat,' in his own appropriate sphere, and with his own *independent, incommunicable consciousness!* Of so much use has been the illustration unwittingly furnished to Christian metaphysics by the orator of Rome—'Tres personas unas sustineo [meam, adversarii, judicis']. But to carry the case a little further; let us suppose the aforesaid Lord Chancellor to delegate an agent with

full power and authority to adjudicate on the case, and, if possible, to retrieve the affairs of some despairing suitor,—what should we think of the ingenious disputant who should insist that this agent was *co-substantial* with the source of his authority; and, after imposing some mystical name upon him—whether of 'manifestation,' or 'relation,' or 'capacity,' or 'person,' or 'somewhat'—should actually convert him into part and parcel of the very nature, instead of accepting him as the appointed, subordinate and obedient *minister*, of the high personage in whose beneficent work he was engaged?

"Need I pursue this further? 'Balance,' then, dear Sir, if you will, the internal probabilities of Scripture; but, despite of the mists which are sedulously interposed to obscure or extinguish it, *let in the light* which presses from without—aye, and from above too—that 'candle of the Lord in the breast of every man living, which the breath or power of authority cannot wholly put out'—and the question will speedily be decided, your doubts will be dispelled, and unity, absolute unity, just such unity as constitutes in you or me our personal and conscious oneness, will be found to be demonstrably predicable of the Source of all being. But, after all, why this 'balancing'? Take away from the one scale the effect of the associations of early instruction, authority, books, conversation, friendship, fashion, with all the resulting hopes and fears, *earthly* and unearthly, which insensibly fetter even vigorous and original minds,—let us, at least, *make allowance* for these,—placing at the same time in the opposite scale the presumptions in favour of the 'reasonable and the simple,'—and will not this balancing be wonderfully changed?

"It has been said that Dr. Watts was frequently known to wish that the effect of a perusal of Scripture upon a mind entirely unimbued with the notions of Christendom one way or the other could be ascertained, and that such a test would go far to prove what the real doctrines of Scripture were. Now it so happens that we have recently had *precisely the test so required*, and we have seen in the example of the most remarkable genius of modern India—you will at once understand me to allude to the Rajah Rammohun Roy—the conclusions to which a truly impartial and intelligent investigation of Scripture would in every such trial, according to all probability, conduct. Give me leave, then, to ask, if this balancing be entitled to that character of 'fact' which you claim for it, could *such a fact* have escaped the observation of a person so unexceptionably qualified to detect it? 'Surely,' as that wonderful person himself remarked, 'the unbiassed judgment of one who has proceeded in the study of the sacred Scriptures with an anxious desire to discover the truth they contain, ought, as far as authority goes in such matters, to outweigh the opinions of any number who have either not thought at all for themselves, or have studied after prejudice had laid hold of their

minds, and who must be always inclined, even after their reason has become matured, to interpret the sacred books in a manner favourable to their preconceived opinion. What fair inquiry respecting the doctrine of the Trinity can be expected from one who has been on the bosom of his mother constantly taught to ask the blessing of God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost?' 'Could Hindooism,' he asks, 'continue after the present generation, or bear the studious examination of a single year, if the belief of their idols being endued with animation were not carefully impressed on the young before they come to years of understanding?' So greatly, my dear Sir, in this, as in all other instances, must it depend on our previous habits of thought what weight we concede to or subtract from the evidences of any disputed opinion.

"There are states of mind in which any or every thing might appear to be 'balanced,' on consulting the naked testimony of Scripture. Time was when passive obedience was not even supposed to be balanced. It was palpably legible in every book of Holy Writ. And to this hour how many are to be found who, with the sage indecision of Sir Roger de Coverley, contend that 'much may be said on both sides' in reference to doctrines, practical and speculative, which the progress of humanity, a juster policy and a better criticism, are throwing into the shade? War, slavery, the punishment of death, coercion for religious opinion—in the social system; in theology, perhaps even still, what once was a favoured opinion, the eternal perdition of infants dying without baptism, even such as perish before birth,—but avowedly the purely arbitrary election of a very few to eternal bliss, and the no less arbitrary pre-ordained consignment of the infinite majority of the human race to the torments of hell-fire for ever; to which we may add, by way of relief, the gentler delusions, if not of transubstantiation itself, at least of the real presence in the Eucharist;—all these doctrines and practices have been presumed to repose on scriptural sanctions; and in the last case especially so even was the balancing once thought to be, that we have the remarkable confession of Luther, that on *that* point he could never find it in his heart to be altogether a Protestant: 'Je ne puis m'en degager, les paroles du texte sont trop fortes, ceci est mon corps, ceci est mon sang, et rien n'est capable de les oter de mon esprit.'

"I have been thus diffuse upon this passage of your letter, because I am most anxious that you should re-consider it, and only assign its due value to what you claim as a fact, on considering the *counter-fact* I have furnished to you in the example of Rammohun Roy, independently of the rebutting evidence of which I myself am an instance; for assuredly as little am *I* convinced of the fact for which you would seem to contend. To speak in the language of inductive philosophy, experience proves

it to be difficult to ascertain a fact, and perhaps what I have here taken the liberty of urging may incline you to see a fitting application of this truth in the matter in hand. Be this as it may, however, most devoutly can I declare that I see no balancing in the case.

"By the highest of all authorities I am told that 'the only true God is the Father.' How am I to get over this? By what text or congregation of texts shall I be able to balance it? But even granting that any words so explicit on the other side could be adduced, in what manner would divine *truth*—that blessing of which the scriptural symbol is *light*—in what manner would this truth, this light, be thereby promoted? Suppose it to be declared in so many words, beyond all possibility of doubt or question, 'that the only true God is the Son,' then see what must follow; either, first, the Father excludes the Son, or the Son excludes the Father; for there cannot be *two* only Gods; or, secondly, the Father and the Son are so absolutely one and the same, that whatever is predicable of the one must be equally so of the other; and so by a legitimate inversion we may say, that 'to us there is but one God, Jesus Christ, and one Lord, the Father;' nay more, that the Father is sent as well as the Son, and the Son the sender as well as the Father; or, to sum up all possible prodigies at once, that the Father is the Son, and the Son the Father! Is this, then, a beam of that *light* which emanates from the throne of the Eternal? Rather is it not thick, palpable, soul-depressing darkness?

"I beseech you, then, dear Sir, to determine where these metaphysical, but strictly deducible, enormities are to end. For my part, I protest I know not, unless men will be contented with the faith which is set down for them, and, forbearing—I will not say to be wise—but inventive, above what is written, will reconcile themselves to believing—not that Jesus is God the Son, but that which he emphatically declares himself to be,—the Son of God. It is such a faith I find promulged—'Whosoever shall confess that *Jesus is the Son of God*, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.' It was upon this confession the eunuch was baptized; it was upon this confession that Peter was pronounced to be blessed; nay, upon this confession it was that the church of Christ was built *as upon a rock*, against which the waves of time or the power of evil should in vain essay their strength.

"I pass on to a remark, which I own has occupied my thoughts —may I say has excited my surprise—in no slight degree. You propose it to Unitarians, as a test of their *liberality*, that they should consent to *worship* 'God in Christ,' or, as you again express it, 'God incarnate.' Now to this I have mainly and at once to object, that I am unable to frame to myself such an object of worship even in idea. Figuratively and loosely speaking, I

see much in the expression, 'God in Christ,' to love and prize and bring home to my heart; but theologically and strictly understood, I must declare that my conception of God—indelibly, immutably, invincibly—is that of a Spirit, having no relation whatever to body. On this point I acquiesce to the very letter in the definition contained in the first Article of the Church of England,—that God is a Being 'without body, parts or passions;' and if it were possible to hesitate as to its propriety, that hesitation would be instantly overborne by the express affirmation of Christ himself—and blessed be Heaven we have so true and guileless an instructor!—'that God is a Spirit; that they who worship Him, must worship Him in spirit and in truth; and that the Father — pray observe this—the Father is *that God* who seeketh such to worship Him.' Is it then *truth* or fiction—is it piety or outrage, for one and the same Church to affirm that that pure, unchangeable and all-present Spirit whom she defines to be '*without* body,' nevertheless *has* a body?—and that the impassible Being whom she describes as 'without parts or passions,' may yet be subject to 'passion,' and be made to undergo pain, agony and death, under the hands of men? And let it be remembered that in this predicament the refuge of the *two natures* —of which, however, I observe, with some surprise, you do not avail yourself—affords but a treacherous aid; for we must suppose that the Romish devotion adopted in the English service was intended to be addressed to that portion of Christ which was capable of hearing and relieving—that is to say, the divine portion of him.*

---

* "Much as I have already trespassed—and am still to trespass—on your time and patience, may I avail myself of this opportunity of adverting to a passage by Archbishop Whately, in his Errors of Romanism, which struck me very forcibly for its undesigned adaptation to the subject I have glanced at above? He is speaking of the *mental reservation* which the patrons of civil interference in matters of religion have attributed to our Lord, when he declared that 'his kingdom was not of this world,' and in his just reprobation of such a notion proceeds to observe—'But the very idea is blasphemous of attributing such a subterfuge to Him who came into the world that He might bear witness of the truth.'

"Now let us compare with this very proper indignation, the curiously similar comment of an author of some little note in the world—I mean John Milton—who in discussing the words of our Lord, Matt. xx. 23, takes occasion to reprove what he terms 'that commonly-received drama of the personalities in the Godhead,' in the following manner:

"'It is not mine to give, &c.—that is, in my mediatorial capacity, as it is commonly interpreted. But questionless when the ambition of the mother and her two sons invited them to prefer this important petition, they addressed their petition to the *entire nature* of Christ, how exalted soever it might be, praying him to grant their request according to the utmost of his power, whether as God or man. Christ also answers with reference to *his whole nature*, 'It is not mine to give,' declaring that it was altogether out of his province, and the exclusive privilege of his Father. If his reply were meant solely to refer to his mediatorial capacity, it would have bordered on sophistry, which *God forbid that we should attribute to him;* as if he were capable of evading the request of Salome and her sons by the quibble which the logicians call *expositio prava* or *equivoca*, when the

"Nevertheless, both these Churches in common are actually guilty at once of the absurdity and the irreverence of ascribing to this *divine portion* of him those sufferings which yet it is a main design of the hypothesis of the two natures to limit to the human: for what other construction can their language admit—'By thine agony and bloody sweat—by thy cross and passion—by thy precious death and burial'? Pray *whose* death and burial? If that of the man, the prayer is idolatrous; if that of God, it is insane and blasphemous; if that of a something inseparably compounded of both, then what becomes of the inseparability at the moment those words were uttered on the cross, 'My God, my God! why hast Thou forsaken me?'

"Upon such purely Popish monstrosities, upon the 'golden sanctions and pious proclamations' of brain-sick emperors and ferocious priests, it is that professing Protestants to this hour are contented to construct their form of adoration. Forgetting, in their imaginary purism, the affinity which chains them to a church whose more consistent insanities—you know it is possible, cum ratione insaniere—taught our eighth Henry to swear by 'God's body,' and commanding the familiar invocation of God's mother, have actually attempted, if I mistake not, to provide for the due recognition of God's grandmother! Where, then, again and again I ask, are these deplorable aberrations to cease? and where are we to find any rest for our souls from these outpourings of superstition, fanaticism and credulity, except in the calm, rational, consistent teachings of undistorted, unexaggerated Scripture itself? Why embrace difficulties, as it were, for difficulties' sake? Why not labour to render that which is so inestimably precious as Christianity, as *credible* as may be? Why oppress it with doctrines 'at which Reason stands aghast, and Faith herself is half confounded,' until the insuperable necessity for so doing shall have been fairly and fully demonstrated? And even then, O God! what a triumph for human hearts to endure, that that which they had fondly revered as the source of so much light and joy and blessedness, was to be consigned to the inflated fanaticism and bigotry of one half the world, and the withering scepticism and scorn of the other!

"I ask these questions because I have never yet seen any proposition from Scripture in behalf of the proper divinity of Christ, which could not be neutralized by considerations drawn

---

respondent answers in a sense, or with a mental intention, different from the meaning of the questioner. And the same may be said of other passages of the same kind where Christ speaks of himself,' &c.

"It would be curious—were the subject suggested to his thoughts—if, seeing the force of the remark I have quoted from his own pages, the Archbishop should be wholly insensible to its effect in the masterly argument undertaken by Milton. But there is no saying: in theology, as in dreams, things so often 'go by contraries,' that no inconsistency ought to surprise one. He who remembers the 'paradoxes' of Bacon, might tremble for the greatest of minds.

either from the ambiguous sense, or the doubtful authority, or the irrelevant application of the passage so quoted. For example, 'God manifest in the flesh.' Well, supposing this text to be genuine, which it is not—supposing all that Sir Isaac Newton and others have alleged against it to go for nothing—supposing the text of Griesbach, which you know rejects it, to be in utter error—and supposing the charge of fraudulent tampering against a single Greek father, or zealous or mistaken copyist, to be wholly void of proof—nevertheless, why, upon any principle, except that the more voracious and indiscriminating my belief is, by so much the better Christian, as certainly the better Hindoo or Mussulman, I should be*—why, I say, am I to close at once with a dogma, the difficulties and contradictions of which are absolutely endless, rather than simply expound the passage as Christ himself explained the analogous words, 'He that hath *seen* me, hath *seen* the Father'?—which he very plainly does in the succeeding verse—'The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of *myself;* but the Father that dwelleth in me, *he* doeth the *works*.' 'He that sent me is *with* me.' Just as Nicodemus had said, 'No man can *do the works* that thou doest, except God be *with* him;' and just as the evangelist Luke relates, that after the raising of the widow's son 'the people glorified God, saying that a *great Prophet* is risen up amongst us, and that God hath *visited* his people.' Had Christ said, He that *receiveth* me, *receiveth* the Father, there would have been nothing wonderful in it; for they would have been easily explained by the words, 'He that receiveth *you*, receiveth *me;* and he that receiveth me, receiveth Him that sent me.' Wherefore, then, should the perfectly analogous phrase, 'He that *seeth* me, *seeth* the Father,' be thought one iota more mysterious? or wherein does it fail as the obvious exponent of the not more bold and figurative phrase—supposing that phrase to be Scripture—'God manifest in the flesh'? It is rather remarkable that all this while Christ is described in the Scriptures as being the 'Image of the invisible God'—assuredly, therefore, not that invisible God himself; who, moreover, is described as the Being 'who only hath immortality—dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto—whom no man hath seen or can see.'

"But if I am thus insensible to anything like *mystery* in the passage already discussed—and what Paul meant by mystery, transcendently such, may be plainly seen in Eph. i. 9, 10, and Col. i. 26, 27—by what possibility am I to see it in that argument for the religious adoration of Christ which you found on the words inadvertently quoted by you in the following form:

---

* "Such was once the proudly orthodox distinction of the inhabitant of the Nile:

Qualia demens
Ægyptus portenta colat.

'That all men should worship the Son, even as they worship the Father'? It is surely only necessary to remind you that the expression is, 'That all men should *honour*—τιμωσι—the Son, even as they honour the Father.' In order to satisfy your judgment of the true and simple meaning designed by our Lord, let us observe what follows: 'He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who sent him.' Now supposing this honour to mean religious adoration, I have but one or two very short questions to ask: Would the proposition in that sense be true? Is it a fact that Peter and John held themselves bound by such a rule in their prayer as recorded in Acts iv. 24? Is it a fact that Paul came up to Jerusalem to worship the Son, when he declared that 'after the manner which his accusers called heresy, so worshiped he the God of his fathers'? Is it a fact that Paul inculcated such a worship on the Athenians in that memorable discourse of his on Mars' hill? Believing these questions to be of some moment in the inquiry, as such I leave them without further comment.

"Returning, however, to the more sober view of the passage relied on, and taking for our guide the closely connected clause I have referred to, viz., 'He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath sent him,' let us inquire, have we any parallel passage to produce which may serve to shew *what* the honour is that is here intended? I think we have, and in particular that of Luke x. 16, in the instructions of our Lord to the twelve disciples: 'He that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me.' But in what did this despising—this contrary to honouring consist? Here, again, let us see how the parallel place in Matthew represents it: 'He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth Him that sent me.' The despising, therefore, was the not receiving of Christ and his authorized messengers; so that by a process not unlike the Algebraic—the substitution of equivalent quantities—it can be easily shewn that the description of 'honour' required by Christ was simply the hearing of his claims and the belief in his authority as 'the Sent' of God; in particular, that all judgment having been committed to him by the Father, men should hear *his* words and obey *his* commandments with precisely the same reverence they would evince, had God himself condescended to deliver them. In both cases, it was the same authority—in both, the same power—that of the *Father*—which would be exerted, and which could not be the less binding that they were mediately and instrumentally made known by his accredited messenger, instead of directly from the throne of the Father himself. Consistently with this view, we find our Lord immediately subjoining, 'He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me'—attesting as He does my mission by the wonderful works He

enables me to do—'hath everlasting life.' And in order further to shew *why* men should confidingly submit to his judgment, he takes occasion to assure them by expressly declaring, 'I can of mine own self do nothing; as I hear, I judge; and my judgment is just, because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me.'

"So little ground does there appear, upon the evidence of this text, for religious adoration towards a person who in every instance without exception, in the use of the pronoun, I, me, myself, broadly and emphatically distinguishes between himself and that Lord God, his Father and our Father, 'whom only we are to worship and to serve' (λατρευειν).

"And yet, painfully sensible as I am of the length to which my dissertations have run—for letter I cannot call it—I am bound to advert to a notice, at the conclusion of yours, of one more passage—happily the last with which I am to trouble you—which at first hearing might be thought to sound something like an argument the other way, but to which I had imagined few, in the present state of the controversy, would be disposed to resort: 'The Father and I are one.' Suffice it to say, that in order to determine *the sense* of this oneness with God, it appears to me a reference should be had to *exactly the same words* in John xvii., where Christ prays that 'the disciples may be one, even as he and the Father are one,'—a sense which must be palpable indeed, when even Calvin could avow that 'the ancients improperly applied this passage'—and how many silly things these ancients thought, by the bye—'to prove that Christ is of the same substance with the Father. For Christ does not argue concerning unity of substance, but speaks of *the consent* which he has with the Father; so that whatever is done by Christ, will be confirmed by the Father's power.' To that power Christ refers all; and it strikes me it would be no bad test of our Christianity were we to be content to do and to say as Christ himself did. 'Whatever,' says Martha, 'thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee.' 'Jesus saith unto her, Said I not unto thee that thou shouldst see the glory of God?' 'And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. And I know that thou hearest me always; but because of the people which stood by, I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me.' 'Now have they known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me, *are of thee*.' Finally, be it remembered, the Son—not Jesus merely, but the Son—the second Person in the supposed co-equal Trinity—yes! let it be deeply registered in every Christian soul—'the Son can of himself do nothing;' and the mystical dogma delusively ascribed to the words, 'The Father and I are one,' vanishes into thin air before the indestructible, consistent and purely intelligible truth, 'The Father is greater than I.'

"And now having committed the offence, I have at length, like all too late repenting sinners, to deprecate the displeasure too justly to be feared as the consequence. Yet I am not without hope, but would fain persuade myself that the interest you have permitted me to take and to express in the doctrinal opinions which sway such a mind as yours, will have some efficacy in procuring me a pardon for entering so largely and critically into the examination of opinions which I am presuming enough to think —so far as they belong to you—consort but indifferently with the character of your understanding, and with the pure and beautiful conceptions of the religion of the gospel which you prevailingly express. You say that you avow to your friends that your theological studies have long been 'carried on in the spirit of the divines called Unitarians.' As a Unitarian myself—as connecting my every hope and thought of the eternal world—as nourishing my daily spiritual life—and blessing my God and Father for the means of grace and for the hope of glory dispensed to us by his Son Jesus Christ—in a word, as interweaving my whole religious existence with such views as alone can render Christianity to me intelligible, credible and instructive—as alone can render it a light unto my path and a comfort to my heart—I would to God you were not in part, but altogether—in letter as in spirit—such as I am, save my inferior powers of vindicating the truths of God, and my experience—every day more vivid—of the incompatibility of these rational and consoling views of our God and of his Christ with a comfortable intercourse with unsympathizing friends—or a world but little disposed either to understand or to respect the fearless and disinterested prosecution of unfavoured opinions.

"But Truth, we know, is a hardy plant, and will sooner or later bring forth fruit abundantly. We believe that a brighter time is coming, and with strides perceptibly accelerating. In the meantime, the servant must not be greater than his Lord; and even were our troubles incomparably more formidable than they are or ever *can* be again—thanks to the champions who have conquered the most precious of our liberties—we know who has said, 'In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.'

"Believe me to remain, dear Sir, with a lively interest in everything you think and write, and with humble trust that God may bless these thoughts with good to you, to me, or to us both,

"Ever your faithful and obliged servant," &c. &c.

(To be continued.)

## A MINISTER'S RETROSPECT.

### Chapter XII.

### MIDDLE-AGE MINISTRY.

The congregation at B. was tolerably numerous. It contained perhaps between 90 and 100 subscribers; but, many of these being (as was natural in a commercial town) solitary residents, away from their family connections, the whole number of persons connected with the place was not more than 300 at the utmost, and the morning attendance might be estimated at about 200. The congregation was decidedly influential for the number of its members, indeed quite beyond that proportion. Collectively they held a high character in the town and neighbourhood. They had ever been first and foremost (as indeed is generally the case with our people) in every good work, and in all matters of public business. Tradesmen, of whatever religious denomination, regarded them as the safest and most desirable people to deal with, whether as wholesale producers or as customers. Tract-distributing ladies who visited the poor with ample supplies of doctrinal, if not spiritual food, often paid us the compliment of recommending their beneficiaries to call upon us for the substantials of benevolence. My poor's purse had many demands arising from these recommendations, the authors of which were always however anonymous, no doubt through a feeling of delicacy on their part.

There was a comfortable minister's house belonging to the chapel estate, and forming virtually part of his salary. In this house I lived, and found it suitable to my purposes on the whole, though I might not perhaps have chosen that very house if I had been quite free to choose for myself. With the growth of the town it was becoming somewhat too smoky and noisy; and in my successor's time (this process still going on to its further disparagement as a clean and quiet residence) it was converted, I believe, into offices or a shop.

It has often been a question with me whether it is the wisest way of endowing a chapel to build a minister's house. It was a plan frequently adopted by the founders of our Presbyterian trusts, and was done by them in humble imitation of the vicarage or rectory belonging to the parish church. It has its conveniences certainly, so long as the state of the town is such as to make the house a fit residence for a quiet, studious man. But even then, the same house cannot be equally suitable for every occupant. A bachelor may be lost in it, and a married man with a large family, or keeping a boarding-school, might find the same house too small. These objections apply equally, it is evident, to the parish vicarage or rectory. If the founders would endow the chapel permanently and safely to the same amount by giving

property of another kind, it might perhaps be better. But if such property consisted of houses, it would only be in the condition of the minister's house when let (as it often is) to some other tenant. As for the probability that, in the growth of a thriving town, the house may become unsuitable as a residence for a minister, this evil usually carries its own cure, sooner or later, in the growing value of the property, which when let for business purposes will more than pay the minister's rent on the outskirts of the town. I know several chapel-houses which have experienced this change of destination, to the increased value of the trust; so that one could scarcely wish the trustees a better investment of the original estate. In founding a new chapel at the present day, therefore, if there is a disposition to build a minister's house also, I should say the chief question to consider would be, whether the situation most suitable for the chapel is also (as in a moderate-sized town it may be, or in some particular district of a large town) the most suitable for the minister's residence; or whether the one should be erected in the heart of the town and the other in an airy suburb. It is a good and safe endowment to that extent, and in that view very desirable.

Those, indeed, who regard the endowment of our chapels, in whatever form, as a misfortune or as a sin against the true Dissenting principle, may wish every existing chapel-house burnt down, uninsured. But my *voluntaryism* is too old-fashioned and moderate to run riot thus. I am, indeed, a decided advocate of the principle of endowments, not as superseding, but as aiding and equalizing, the annual support of public worship. As in all other societies, so in religious congregations, there are ebbs and flows of popularity and success. The supporters of a chapel in one generation may be much more numerous and wealthy than those connected with it in another. Nor can it be dissembled that many families of the old Dissenting stock are continually going off to Church in the third or fourth generation of inherited wealth. In larger religious bodies than ours (or even in our own congregations in the largest towns), the average contributions to public worship will not vary so much with the death or departure of one or two rich members; but in our smaller congregations, the loss of one generous supporter of the place is often a matter of very serious consequence to the minister (and thereby to the cause of public worship thenceforth), unless that member has, with generous foresight, made provision for a future endowment equivalent or nearly so to his contribution hitherto. Now I for one do not expect that Unitarian worship,—free, generous and cheerful as are the religious views and feelings implied in it,—will soon prevail against the dull dead-weight of Conformity, the terror of prescriptive orthodoxy, and the new pseudo-liberalism which reconciles itself to the profession of the symbol that is no longer believed, and calls itself spiritual for so doing. These

are inventions on the part of the world (the wicked world and the religious world joining hands upon the device) for keeping up a hollow show of orthodoxy and escaping the uncomfortable imputation of heresy. But the fact that these strong tendencies exist in the religious world at present does not alter or diminish, but rather makes more imperative, our duty as representatives of honest and free thought in religion. Not less, but all the more important does the testimony of the Unitarian church appear to me, as directed at once to the assertion of the reasonableness of religion, and to the illustration of high honour in the whole matter of belief or disbelief.

The question has often been debated, whether man is *responsible* for his opinions or not. Strict orthodoxy has decreed again and again, and still maintains, that he is, and that he is so in the sense of being responsible for the particular opinions which he arrives at. The true faith saves, and the false faith is penal. Add a Pope to decide between the true and the false, and orthodoxy is consistent and complete. But omit the Pope, as orthodox Protestants in and out of the Church of England do, and orthodoxy goes halting. Mental and moral philosophers have felt the irrationality of such a position, and been ready to maintain the opposite doctrine that man is *not* responsible for his opinions; meaning thereby, that the particular opinions which he may arrive at are not in themselves meritorious or penal in the court of Conscience or of God. Some have indeed expressed themselves very loosely and objectionably on this subject, as if there was no exercise of the moral faculties at all in the pursuit or profession of belief. Lord Brougham, when installed Lord Rector of Glasgow nearly thirty years ago, frightened the orthodox and astonished even the thoughtful by declaring, in his slashing style, that man was no more responsible for his belief than for the height of his stature or the colour of his hair (or some such comparison). Unitarian Christians have always been the persons best able and most anxious to distinguish the true limits of this question, and have generally maintained that while no man can be called upon by any sense of moral duty to hold particular specified opinions, every man is morally bound by high honour and faithfulness to go through a truth-loving process in their attainment; so that, though a man is not responsible for the absolute truth or the particular complexion of his opinions, he is responsible for the way he obtains them;—he is responsible for earnestness and truthfulness of spirit in forming them, and for entire sincerity and disinterestedness in holding them. And so there is a grave responsibility attaching to the matter of belief all the while. And this real moral obligation demands the very thing which our new modes of evading controversy tend so to discourage; namely, earnest individual truth-loving, diligent individual truth-seeking, and transparent individual truth-avowal,

according to every man's own perception of the truth. A clear view of the morality of this question at once defies the ignorant anathemas of orthodoxy; but does it not equally repudiate those technical creeds for which some among us are ready to apologize, with needless self-sacrifice, when we have removed their "damnatory clauses"? Does it not enforce an individuality of belief which is virtually renounced in the attempt to apologize for, to explain (and almost explain away) the time-hallowed formularies of orthodox belief? If the Unitarian church should ever cease to be characterized by its long-tried high morality on the subject of belief and profession, I know not where we shall look for the practical ethics of religious conviction.

When I settled at B., the services were morning and afternoon; but there was already a growing desire for evening services among perhaps the larger part of the congregation. I met this feeling in the first instance by giving a third service during three months in the winter season, and touching doctrinal and expository subjects, according to public announcement, in the evening discourse or lecture. I did this for, I think, three successive winters. Some of my congregational friends thought it was too much for the minister; but it was quite plain to me that it was too much for the congregation. It was not to be expected (nor could I desire it) that they should attend three services a day. I believed, as I do now, that they would gain more benefit from two;—two services devoutly attended and well thought of, and the rest of the Sunday suitably employed at home in intelligent and kindly family occupations. The result of the experiment was (as I expected) to thin still further the afternoon congregation, which had not been large previously; and it was ultimately resolved to change the afternoon service permanently, the year round, for an evening one. The same change was going on in many of our congregations about this time. It was greatly encouraged by the growth of gas-lighting, which made it easy to light a chapel and at the same time safe to walk the streets at night. But while the "stream of tendency" proved itself too strong to be resisted, there was something to be said (as I am old-fashioned enough to feel) in behalf of the afternoon at chapel and the evening at home, instead of the reverse. I never was an ascetic in my views of the proper way of spending Sunday. I would indeed hold it sacred from all compulsory toil, except such as is necessary to the safety of society and as the means of rational enjoyment to the community in general. It is emphatically the day of privilege to all workers. It is the poor man's charter of rest and worship; the day of blessings to body and soul alike. I would have it a happy day, while in the best sense a holy day. To children especially I would never have it associated with ideas of gloom, but of exemption from toil and of cheerful, thankful happiness. It should be, to parents and children, above all the days of the week,

*a family day.* And the natural order of sequence with this end in view would seem to be to occupy the earlier part or parts of the day with public worship, and so let the church consecrate the home for the rest of the day. This is the *family* view, as expressed on behalf of the comfortable classes of society, who find no difficulty in coming out and bringing their families with them to the morning service. With persons of a humbler class in life (or their wives at least) the case is different, and the choice lies only between an afternoon and an evening service; and on their behalf it is alleged with some degree of force that the evening service is usually more lively and animated (on the part of the attendants, if not of the minister too) than the afternoon. There is meanwhile, in large towns especially, a large class of young men and others unconnected with families on the spot, for whom no more desirable place of resort surely could be opened than their place of worship. These reasons again vary in their force from town to country districts. In the latter, the afternoon service is commonly the best attended of the two (or of the three where there are three). I suppose I must leave the question to be settled (as in truth it will be without my help) in each place according to the local perception of what is best and most acceptable. We changed afternoon for evening service at B., and the attendance was certainly increased.

While at B. I gave grievous offence, though quite unintentionally and unconsciously, to one of the heads of the congregation by a "political sermon." The occasion was the rejection of the Reform Bill by the votes of the Bishops in the House of Lords in the year 1831. The propriety of pulpit allusions to political events has often been a moot point among our ministers. I never could approve the boast of those who had made it a point of conscience on no account to touch upon politics; but at the same time there have been others who have done it very unwisely and unjustifiably. Dissent itself is necessarily political to a certain extent, and in those days was felt to be more so than now. And what are politics but public morals? Ought they to pass unchallenged, unreproved and unguided by the Christian pulpit? To lay down the precise rule of action may be difficult, perhaps impossible; but it was plain to me that some men's silence was as unbecoming as some men's preaching. I must take credit to myself for some degree of prudence (or a sense of religious fitness perhaps) that I never got wrong in this direction in my younger days, when Sidmouth and Castlereagh offered many an opportunity. I felt that there were more fit, as well as safer, occasions for speaking and writing free thoughts about the specific sins of the English government at home and abroad; and it was a rule with me never to allude to *mere* politics in the pulpit; so that I never was, in any true sense of that term, obnoxious to the reproach of preaching *politics.* The war against Napoleon, and

the peace ensuing after Waterloo, were occasions, however, of too deep national interest to be unnoticed in the place and seasons of special religious thought. I used fast-days and thanksgiving-days too, almost whenever proclaimed by authority, for the purpose of explaining the right and wrong use of such observances, and in the hope of reading, sometimes at least, a more wise and religious comment upon the public affairs of the day than was apt to be heard in most churches and chapels. The other Dissenters of that day usually shut their chapels on such occasions (as some of us did also), in sign of their stern dissent from Royal Authority in matters of religion. I think they lost so many valuable opportunities, of which I, like many of my brethren, took advantage, for speaking plainly and religiously about other public matters as well as the question of Royal Authority. At the present day it is no longer a sign of Nonconformity to close the meeting-house on a fast or thanksgiving day; nor is what is preached on such an occasion always indicative of Conformity and Dissent respectively. Ordained clergymen have spoken freely and wisely on the Crimean (and now on the Indian) war; and voluntaries of first water have in Congregational pulpits expounded the judgments of Cholera, Famine, &c., to the letter of the Royal Proclamations in such cases provided. I believe, on careful recollection of the occasion on which I gave political offence, that my touchy auditor was exceptional in his taste as hearer, rather than I in mine as preacher. I remember my text: "He looked for judgment, and behold oppression; for righteousness, and behold a cry!" I felt that the national sense of right and justice had spoken and been recognized in the House of Commons, and that true religion and morality were concerned in its adoption by the legislature; and when it met with a haughty repulse in the House of Lords, the legal representatives of the religion of the country in that House being conspicuous in the rejection of the claim, I preached what my English love of justice and my Christian sense of right prompted, and as my spiritual freedom as a Dissenter gave me words. The old gentleman who took offence (and who spoke very offensively to me afterwards) was decidedly aristocratic in his feelings and already a conformist in taste; and had he not held a good old Dissenting name, I believe he would have conformed before that time. He did it in the persons of his children instead, and himself gave up chapel gradually without going to church; but (I must do him that justice) not on the occasion on which my preaching had offended him, nor till many years afterwards. I have never before nor since been squeamish about alluding in a religious spirit to public events of sufficient importance; nor ever except that once had reason to suppose I had offended the religious feeling or prejudice of any among my hearers.

But there was another question of pulpit taste on which I had

the misfortune often to disappoint, if not to offend. This was in connection with funeral sermons. There are, I suppose, in other congregations as well as those with which I have been connected, not a few persons who partake the vulgar orthodox idea (shall I call it?) of a funeral sermon, as one in which the virtues of the deceased are to be set forth duly and truly (or a little more fully than truly), his faults well smoothed down and apologized for, and his death-bed experience detailed for the edification of the survivors, with especial mention of his very last words. This style of thing never suited my idea of what was right towards the dead, or soothing to the survivors, or really edifying to a congregation. I had once, in early life, myself undergone the purgatory of enduring something of this kind at the hands of a very worthy and well-meaning man, on the death of an honoured and loved relative of my own. He spoke nothing but what was perfectly true; but he betrayed the holiest secrets of the heart and home, and chafed into fever every trembling fibre of affection. I never could, as a preacher, risk doing what I had, as a mourning hearer, suffered. I ran the risk, therefore, of disappointing those who might like, or think it edifying, to be so treated, rather than of galling any one who loved the dead gently and reverently. So I preached not the dead, but the death. I always endeavoured to make my subject appropriate to the circumstances, and trusted the application to those who were concerned to make it. The judicious often thanked me on such occasions, saying it was "suitable," "consoling," and the rest, often that it was "delicate and unobtrusive in its allusions." On the other hand, I often had reason to know that I gave great disappointment, especially when orthodox friends and neighbours had been invited in great numbers to fill two pews that one Sunday morning. "It scarcely was like a funeral sermon," was sometimes said to me. "I think you might have made it so in your pew," I replied to one such remonstrance; "but I did not wish it to be so to all the rest of the congregation." This latter is a consideration that does not strike such people; but surely it is the minister's duty to remember that he is addressing others besides those specially interested. In a large congregation there might be scarcely anything but funeral sermons from one end of the year to the other; and then what would become of general Christian doctrine, morals and edification? The purer taste is satisfied by a service which it can appropriate specially for itself amid all that is acceptable to the general audience on less special grounds. One class of exceptions, of course, I made to this rule, but one only, namely, when the deceased bore a public character. But even then, the rule restrained me from parading what was not properly of public interest.

My residence at B. was nearly coincident with my married life, which began indeed a little before I went thither, and in its too

early close, alas! left me so stricken and restless as to lead to my relinquishment of congregational duty there, and ultimately to cause my second and final ministerial removal. At this long interval I cannot look full upon those days without strong emotion, while their gentle memory is never wholly absent from me, and is the light and blessing of my age. Days, O how happy! How active, but how peaceful! How strong, but gentle; how full of energy, yet how quiet, is a man whom marriage has made happy! How unselfish, but how full of conscious happiness, is his life! The happiest and most suitable marriages are by no means always those which men have found by deliberate search. The very happiest have dropped upon their paths while it was simply the path of duty, suggesting the adage in its devoutly thankful force, that marriages are made in heaven. I acknowledged that mine must have been, when it made earth dearer and better to me. I had lived actively and conscientiously till nearly thirty-five years of age, finding my happiness in work and duty, and sufficient interest, so far as I knew, in the social and friendly intercourses of life beyond my own lodging, and never feeling less lonely than through the long evenings spent in that lodging in company with my books and pen. I believe a man who at that time of life first feels the emotion of a pure and disinterested love, feels it more deeply and ardently than a younger man. The real romance of my life at least began then, and not in more youthful years; and realized itself in our joint experience of duties, blessings, hopes, cares, such as are the general lot of life, until all at once I was alone again! I must not indulge myself in these tender recollections further than to explain the next stage of my life as a minister. Week after week, and month after month, I was quite unfit for pulpit duty. How should a grieving man appear in public? How speak without faltering? He ought not (I said to myself) to inflict the sense of his personal woes upon others. I could go on firmly and bravely with my week-day work of school-keeping, and not fear to make the happy children sad, while finding myself all the better both for their presence and the occupation they brought me; but my ministry I felt to be a thing impossible, and I resigned it. My congregation most kindly urged me to take half-a-year's, or a whole year's, respite, under a temporary arrangement for the supply of my place; but I did not feel that this would suffice for me, and I was sure it would be very undesirable for them to have a long interval. Thus my engagement with them ended, sadly but most tenderly. Perhaps I shewed myself weak in thus giving way to the impulse of my sorrow. Perhaps it would have been more manly to have stood my ground against it. But I did not. I thought I could not. I doubt even now whether I could have summoned the necessary heroism. And the result seemed to justify me. Withdrawn from public responsibilities, I found time and occupation,

and the claims of my children above all, the means of restoring me gradually to cheerfulness and strength; and when, something more than two years afterwards, I was invited to this quiet, happy spot, where I have dwelt ever since, first at work and then in retirement, I felt thankful to my friends at C. for reminding me that the ministry was my proper calling.

There are few remaining incidents worth detailing in my quiet life; but I think I may usefully recal the part that my contemporaries and myself have taken in years long past in reference to various questions of religious observance which the young men of the present day have taken up as new subjects of interest to the Unitarian world. New to our young men they are, of course; and very right it is that our young men should go into such questions with all zeal and earnestness. And it is with a view to help, not to rebuke, such earnestness that I wish to recal to view what was said and done in my young and middle life in reference to such matters as the services of Baptism and the Lord's Supper and the use of Liturgies in Dissenting worship. Questions of *culte*, I suppose I must call these, in accordance with modern phrase. We used to call them questions of Religious Forms and Ceremonies. I keep them for my next chapter.

---

## MR. KELL IN REPLY TO THE REVIEWER OF HIS SERMON.

Sir,

Had it not been for my repugnance to antagonism, I could have thanked the critic who has given me an opportunity of speaking again for injured, oppressed India. I confess I do not exactly see the intended application of the old story of the surgeon who amputated the wrong leg, unless the writer may mean to imply—in the face of very multiform, with, I thought it had been universally admitted, *no* conflicting evidence—that subject India has been *well* governed. Nor do I see the objection to my assertion that "England conquered India from its native princes." Such *specks* as were ceded for our factories or obtained by treaty, need not surely be *specified* as exceptions to the general truth. And for the use of the word *native*, applied to "our predecessors the native governments, whether Mahomedan or Hindoo, there is abundant authority. But let this pass. Too deeply, too painfully, do I feel India's wrongs and England's responsibility, to care to rebut any such triviality as the "laying hold of the wrong leg," &c. One expression, however, I would notice in the first paragraph bearing immediately on myself, which at once indicates the spirit in which the criticism is written. It runs thus—"His sympathies are warm, but they flow forth most *freely* on the side of the atrocious sepoys." Does this assertion *consist* with my expressions—"the sepoys in their *bloody* insurrection;" "the natives have indeed been guilty of *detestable* deeds;" and, again, "the sepoys, in the heat of vengeance, have done *foul, bloody deeds*"? It is

not, however, so much my object to shew that I am misrepresented, as to furnish evidence, for the good both of my own loved land and of India, that my "black bill of indictment" is, alas! but too true. Nor do *I* find any consolation in the fact, that our aggressions, and "very, very dark spots" of perfidy in India, extend over the hundred years of our rule there. Rather do I smart under the conviction that, when the officers at the beginning of the outbreak said to the native troops at Neemuch, "You have eaten the Company's salt, why are you not faithful to it?" the sepoys *could* say, as they shot them down, "You scoundrels! have *you* been faithful to the King of Oude?" Nor do I see comfort for England that one of her first acts of perfidy was on Surajah Dowlah, whose *officers*, finding no proper place of confinement for 140 prisoners of war, with brutal recklessness of human life, thrust them into the common dungeon. These *heathens* of a bygone century may perchance have said of the British, as British *Christians* are *now* so frequently saying in regard to them, that "mercy to the wretches is death to our own people," that "mercy to them is a *sin*." Surajah Dowlah was sleeping while the foul air of the prison was doing its fearful work. When he awoke and heard that the prisoners were dying, he gave orders for the fatal doors to be opened. Mr. Holwell, commander of the defence, who was one of the prisoners, seems to have thought that, in the use of the too small jail, there was no *intent* to cause the dreadful catastrophe. But if there were, is this horror of vengeful warfare comfort for England's perfidious acts? No; let her cast the beam out of her own eye, and count the *many* hundreds who have fallen of India's peoples, victims to the rapacity and misrule of *her* officers.

In my mention of the fearful famine in 1770, I rest on the authority of Howitt's "Colonization and Christianity." Bengal had then been virtually under British rule six years. Her revenue from the conquered state amounted annually to 250 lacs of rupees! I expressly mentioned that "the drought was the result of *natural* causes." But it were folly to maintain that "hard English monopoly and cupidity, which granaried the scarce grain, refusing to sell any except at the most exorbitant price," did not *help* to bring death upon the people. This is what I stated, and this I believe is fact. Howitt gives the numbers starved at a fourth part of the population, "about three millions." Dreadful famines seem to be the common story of drained, impoverished India. I read from the Bombay Times, "We have famines occurring almost decennially, some of which within our time have swept their millions away. In 1833, in at least *twenty months*, 1,500,000 must have died of famine or its immediate consequences. The living preyed upon the dead; mothers devoured their children; and the human imagination could scarcely picture the horrors that pervaded the land. The direct pecuniary loss to Government exceeded £5,000,000,—a sum which would have gone far to *avert* the calamity, had it been expended in constructing thoroughfares to connect the interior with the coast, or districts where scarcity prevailed with those where human food was to be had in abundance, or on canals to bear to the soil thirsty and barren for want of moisture, the unbounded supplies which our rivers carry to the ocean."

I come now to the traces which England *is said* to have left other than the "vulture and the tiger" leave. And I *must* ask, *where*, *when*,

*how*, has my critic obtained authority for the list he has subjoined? I have before me such a contradictory array of *authorities* and *instances*, as would more than fill the pages of the Reformer, of the wealth and means of wealth which India *once* had, which she has not *now* under British rule, and which are again and again named as the very things she *needs*. Colonel Cotton, in his volume on "Public Works in India," evidently under the same convictions which led me to apply Burke's passage, imagines some spectator of an Indian village exclaiming, "What! are there no Christians here? Do not you instruct them in anything? Have you no roads or any other communication? What in the world do you do? I do not see a *single mark* of an Englishman being in the country." Silk Buckingham writes, "The Hindoo and Mahomedan rulers of India have left remains of roads, bridges, canals, caravansaries, &c., which might put us to shame for our negligence." And from the Bombay Gazette of May 21, 1853 (surely a recent date), reprinted in the Times of June 28, I read, "The question of roads is the question of the day for India, which is ripe for agitation and crying for it.....From Indore to Agra, the construction of a few miles of new road was stopped for upwards of a year, because the Government sum was exhausted before the completion of the work, and the *old road* was left without repair. In passing it, carts were smashed, and bullocks died from exhaustion in numbers sufficient to rend the hearts of the brute beasts themselves, delaying whole trains of carts or droves of pack bullocks for days. *Everywhere* we want roads. It is the continued and crying want of the country." "And wells and tanks. *The former rulers of the country established such supplies at the principal villages.*" Silk Buckingham writes, "In 1832, a railway from Madras to Bangalou was *projected;* in 1836, was *surveyed* and *resolved* upon. In 1833, railroads first attracted attention in the United States; since then, in India, not a *single* railway has been opened beyond 20 miles; while in the same period in the United States more than 10,000 miles have been completed and are in full operation." See, too, from the speech of Baboo Joskisson Mookerjee, delivered in the Town Hall at Calcutta on the passing the recent India Bill—"Many of our magistrates cannot move two miles into the interior of their districts in rainy seasons unless they wade through mud and water sometimes waist, sometimes knee deep. The Great Trunk Road is *called* the great *military* road. The staging bungalows were constructed chiefly for the accommodation of *European* public officers. The *native* travellers, merchants, &c., have not a *shed* to put their heads in. The serais, or inns, *built during former reigns*, have been *all* allowed to go to decay. Along the interior roads the police officers cannot move without inconvenience. Many noble roads, constructed *before* the Company's rule, are allowed to be turned into rice-fields. It is not unusual to see substantial bridges, the roads on each side long washed away. The few internal roads have been chiefly constructed by the zemindars. Noble rivers, formerly navigable and available for irrigation, are allowed to be choked up. We have lost five or six rivers of this description in the districts of Houghly and Burdwan alone." "Sir Charles Wood would make the people of England believe that during the last five years the local government has expended £400,000 in public works of importance. Though we have no access to the accounts, yet we can see and hear, and by these almost

unrefutable tests I find no public works in Bengal of any magnitude executed within that period, which the government was not *bound* to construct, either for the transport of *troops*, or under contract with zemindars, or for keeping up state buildings. Works undertaken purely for internal commerce or the commerce of the people, *nil*."

We do indeed find in "Statistical Papers relating to India"—"Among the public works constructed in Scinde may be mentioned the Kurrachee mole and road, at an expense of £30,961." What is the fact? Sir C. Napier designed, commenced and nearly finished the mole and road; but when he left Scinde, *Government stopped the work*." Again, "On the Indus also, the Government have established steam vessels for the conveyance of goods and passengers from Kurrachee to Mooltan," &c. Sir C. Napier established the steam vessels; but when he left Scinde, *Government stopped the trade*. Oh, it is indeed hard to find any proof of English energy infusing "life into an internal commerce which was," I am now told, "dead or dying under the oppression of former rulers." This is verily the conqueror's fiction! The Edinburgh Review, No. XXXVI. p. 359, mentions that "the unexampled state of *prosperity* which Bengal had attained, demonstrated that, however defective the Mahometan institutions, the country had risen to affluence in *consequence* or in *spite* of them." Sir C. Napier, in his work entitled "Indian Misgovernment," writes—"This is patent to all who have traversed India and looked at the remains of great roads, of great cities, of great palaces, of great mosques. By whom were they constructed? By the sovereigns of India. But where are the public works of the Court of Directors? For a hundred years they have milked the cow, and given her no sustenance. As their Charter draws to a close, a *show* of doing work in the shape of canals is being made, and the railroads will be good. But railroads spring from the spirit of the age. No human power can stop their progress till the whole earth becomes bound in ribs of iron. To Leadenhall Street no thanks are due for railways." See, too, "Indian News," Sept. 12, 1846, on the *was* and *is* of India: "Tanks, wells, caravansaries, and temples, which bespeak a superior attention to all the appliances of life, are rapidly crumbling to pieces without being replaced; and the private houses of the village ryots of any respectable size or appearance are all of *old construction*." Mr. Elphinstone remarks, "It is generally the effect of our institutions to break down the upper class of society." And Henry Mead, in his volume on "The Sepoy Revolt, its Causes and Consequences" (evidently bringing us up to the *present time*)—and he had known India well, had lived ten years in the country, not tethered to one spot, but travelling freely through every part of the land—affirms, "The native aristocracy have been extinguished, and their revenues lost equally to the rulers and the multitude. The native manufacturers are ruined, and no corresponding increase has taken place in the consumption of foreign goods. Not a fourth of the cultivable land is taken up for tillage." "The peasantry are born and die in debt. With the rich soil at their feet, and the burning sun over head, possessing nimble fingers and willing hearts, the ryots have all the elements of a prosperous strength; but faculty lies within them like the vigour of a man who is worn down to the last stage of weakness by famine." "To award the ryot the very smallest share of the

wealth derived from the soil, is the never-ceasing object of the zemindar; and when he has reaped all he can in that field, the police come in and pick up the scattered ears. They are ready at any time to convert a *murder* into a case of *cholera*, or a death by *disease* into an atrocious *homicide*. They will tie up and torture, without hesitation, a *whole village* for the sake of a few rupees. It is a mere chance whether they make the subject to be operated upon a culprit or a witness, and there is scarcely any difference in the consequences. Crime cannot be detected if the criminal is willing to pay; innocence cannot escape if it is poor or believed to have the means of bribing." So much for "a police," of which my critic makes boast, and for "human life as safe as in any part of Europe," and "an administration of justice pure and incorruptible"! But what can reasonably be expected from magistrates, many of them young and inexperienced, often between 22 and 28 years of age, with little or no legal training, imperfect knowledge of the language of the country, but with power to sentence to *three* years' imprisonment in *irons* and *hard labour*, and to fine to a large amount? What would be the feelings of an English gentleman if arrested by the myrmidons of a police superintendent, and taken to the same officer, who is now metamorphosed into a criminal judge, jury and prosecutor? See B. J. Mookerjee on the recent Indian Bill. See, too, the statement of F. H. Robinson, for thirty years civil servant of the Company: "No British servant can be tried for any offence, saving petty assaults, except by the Supreme Court in Calcutta, which privilege, in the remote provinces, amounts to *impunity*. As far as my memory goes, I do not think there has been a *single* instance of the punishment of a British subject for the *murder of a native* within the last thirty years; but *there have been many such murders committed*." "If felonies are thus slurred over, it may be imagined what a mass of petty and irritating outrage is committed by British subjects all over the country." See, too, J. Wilson, twenty-eight years resident in Bengal: "The language of the court is not the dialect of the people; the evidence, therefore, of the witnesses, the accuser, the accused, must be taken in writing by a native examiner, and the whole proofs of the most trivial assault, or of the foulest murder, are carefully arranged by a man who receives ten shillings a month! A *douceur* modifies the evidence materially." "There is no security for property."

My critic speaks of *endowed* "schools in every town and village," and of "colleges" in which the "youths of India are prepared for the civil and military service, in which they are *sure of advancement*." Silk Buckingham says that "village schools abound in India already *among the natives*," and that "all that *would be* necessary would be to place English teachers in *connection* with such schools." Rajah R. D. Bahadoor speaks of two lacs of rupees allowed by Parliament for the encouragement of literature, &c., but says, "This fund has, I believe, been *entirely* appropriated to the establishment of *English* seminaries. Many are the indigenous Sanscrit schools in India conducted at the expense of poor pundits. But *none* of them have received *any* assistance from this fund." And at the same meeting, held after the recent India Bill, B. R. Ghose said, "They all knew that in the Charter Act passed by the Parliament twenty years ago, it was *expressly provided* that no native of India, whether Hindoo or Mahommedan, should, by reason of creed,

colour or birth, be excluded from appointments in the covenanted service. They knew *also* that this provision had in *reality been made a dead letter*, and that the *exclusiveness* of the civil service had been preserved *intact.*" "He could clearly have shewn that privileges, to which they had an undeniable right, had been most obstinately withheld from them." See, too, Bhawoo Dajie: "In India, we have had public education neglected, improvement thrown aside, irrigation and the means of education overlooked; though to neglect such as this we have, since the Charter Act of 1833, been indebted for famines which have swept away nearly *two millions* of human beings."

I pass on now to the "post-office communication, with its religious secrecy." It may be free and secret for Englishmen, but according to Silk Buckingham—see "Coming Era"—for the most important uses it is of no avail to Indians. S. B. states that "cases of flagrant wrongs are perpetually inflicted by the Company's servants;" but "by a rule of their own establishing—a rule at once destructive of *all* secrecy—no memorial complaining of the wrong, or seeking redress, can ever be sent home to the Court of Directors unless transmitted *open* through the local government *that has inflicted the wrong!* The consequence is, that in some cases the memorial never reaches the Directors, and there is no power of calling any one to account for this, either in India or in England. Directors listen to no complaints except they are transmitted through the local authorities; so that, even if appeal is made in person in England, it may be found that redress is as far off as ever." Four cases of such flagrant wrong are now before me. So much for postal safety and administrative justice!

I am quite aware that a free press has been enacted for India. But is not this, like many other enactments for her good, an unsubstantial theory? Even Englishmen complain of the want of a free press; then what must the conquered do! A free press for a people who are not allowed to complain of national wrongs—easily called "direct exhortations to rebellion"—*must* be nominal.

But I must draw to a close. Simple want of space compels me to lay aside a huge mass of evidence of the depressing effects of British rule. From authority within my reach, I have made choice of that which I considered at once *valid*, substantiated by *local* residence and *recent*, bringing us, it will be seen, to the Sepoy revolt. If objection be made to any authority which I have adduced, the facts which rest upon it might generally be supported on other authority, which some might possibly deem more credible. I suspect that many readers are misled by the good which has been *ordained* for India, but which has never, alas! been suffered to bless her peoples. For the story of the conquest of India, I referred mainly to Hugh Murray's "History of British India," which comes down to 1849.

Amidst that fearful sacrifice of human life, for which our own misgovernment is so greatly responsible, I rejoice that we *have* interfered to prevent the sacrifice of life from heathen superstition. And I could have rejoiced—oh, how earnestly, how fervently have rejoiced!—if, with the introduction of the Scriptures into India, we had glorified them by evidencing in our own acts and deeds their spirit of justice, mercy and truth. All who know me will believe that it has been to me a soul-depressing duty thus to dive into and drag to light the darkly-shaded

history of Indian suffering. But I have deeply felt that *her* good—justice to her for the future—could only be promoted by forcing her wrongs on public notice. The truest love for country is not to be manifested in delusive flattery, nor can enlightened patriotism over-ride philanthropy.

Should response be tendered to this letter, I may be permitted to beg that authorities may also be given.

*Southampton, Jan.* 14, 1858. EDMUND KELL.

[It will be seen from the foregoing, that while Mr. Kell is forced to admit the willingness of the English rulers of India to prevent the destruction of human life consequent upon the abominable superstitions of the natives, he denies them the smallest credit for any other act or measure of their Government. Even this one fact, however, should have prevented him from declaring that their rule, if now terminated, would leave *no traces* but those "of the vulture and the tiger!" If we could bring ourselves to think that our readers generally either shared in his views of the Indian crisis, or would look upon a serious refutation of them as other than a waste of type, time and patience, we should accept his challenge to produce authority for every statement we have made. *Many* of his authorities are futile; many of his statements unsound—those about railways and education, for example, palpably so—as are his reasonings in the case of the post-office system. We may add, that when he denies that the English Government has given to India a free press and the free discussion of political measures, he refutes himself; for he produces, as authorities, severe invectives against the ruling powers, copied from the Indian papers. Indeed, every reader of an Indian newspaper can contradict him on this point. We shall not waste our own and our readers' time with any detailed refutation of Mr. Kell's letter.—THE REVIEWER.]

---

## TRINITARIAN CONCESSIONS.

SIR, *Camberwell, Jan.* 22, 1858.

IN continuation of the statement of our friend Mr. Hawkes, in your last number, as to the admission made by Cardinal Wiseman, may I be allowed to remind your readers that a similar concession was made in one or two early numbers of the "Tracts for the Times," where it was adduced, not of course as any reason for doubting the truth of the doctrines referred to, but as an argument for the necessity of some ecclesiastical authority, and the use of tradition. If I mistake not, some valuable remarks appeared on the subject in the Christian Teacher, shortly after the publication of the tract containing the statement.

In conversation with individuals on doctrinal subjects, I have often found a great effect produced by a quotation from some well-known Trinitarian divine, who has given up, as many learned men have, some one or other of the texts adduced by uneducated theologians in favour of the Trinity; and it seems to me that our young ministers, who will yet have to fight the battle of controversy, will do well to make more copious use of the "Concessions of Trinitarians" than has yet been done.

JOHN GREEN.

# CRITICAL NOTICES.

*The Preacher and the Church: Three Sermons preached to the Congregation of Renshaw-Street Chapel, Liverpool, November* 1, 8 *and* 15, 1857, *on resuming his Ministry in that Place.* By John Hamilton Thom. 12mo. Pp. 71. London—Whitfield.

These Sermons are no every-day pulpit effort, but are the outpourings of an earnest and remarkably gifted mind. They contain some things which we do not understand, and some with which we do not at all agree; but the proof of their reality and power is, that the reader (at least if we may judge by our own experience) is so attracted to the preacher by an irresistible sympathy, that, passing by that which he thinks either not clear or not true, he dwells on the "thoughts that breathe and words that burn" which the preacher has flung out in rich profusion. Mr. Thom places before himself a very lofty standard of pulpit duty. He scorns, as every man of enlarged experience and with religion in his heart will necessarily scorn, rhetoric as the means of mere ornament or display. But the man who understands clearly and feels warmly, will, if his thoughts are engaged on a great subject, attain to something better than rhetoric,—natural eloquence. Mr. Thom complains of the want of power which often characterizes the pulpit, and of the faulty appreciation of that power by the majority of the laity. He thus speaks of "Power in the Pulpit:"

"The power of unaffected simplicity, the power of freshness, of earnest feeling coming visibly out of a living spring; the power of deep, searching, loving words, clear as the utterances of a child, but inexhaustible as the heart of Christ; the power of a large spiritual experience, to which the things of the soul are as palpable as the things of sense;—in a word, the touch of nature, the unmistakeable power of reality, dealing calmly with what it knows. This demonstration of the spirit and of power is the rarest of the gifts of God—the power of speaking lucidly and simply of those relations and aspects of our nature which connect us with the Infinite,—with the infinite of Goodness, the infinite of Wisdom, the infinite of Holiness, the infinite of Blessedness, the infinite of Time and of Being. No one can wonder that this is a rare Power—for the experiences which are its subject matter exist only as sentiments, intercommunions of the human spirit with the divine, not definable, and varying in measure and quality with the spiritual habits and capacity of each." P. 9.

We will not stop to expatiate on the exclusiveness of Mr. Thom's view. He is right in making the preacher a *spiritual* guide, but he is surely not right in limiting his functions, as he seems to do, to this one duty.

We make another extract, in which Mr. Thom rebukes many occupants of the pew as well as the pulpit:

"The Pulpit is a representative institution, and like People like Priest, is a proverb that had its origin even in sacerdotal times, when the Priest might have seemed more sheltered from popular influences. The universal demand of all uncultivated, and of many cultivated minds, is for an excitement upon easy terms,—an excitement produced for them by another, without toil or strain of mind or soul to them,—an excitement, too, which, as it is an excitement of *the religious feelings*, they can pass upon themselves for a spiritual act and sacrifice without further cost. There is something unspeakably degrading

in a man being used, like an actor on the stage, turning a Congregation from a Church for edification into an audience for pastime, for the gratification of emotions called religious that yet are to perish in the using, which begin to subside with the long-drawn breath that releases the not fatigued mind, and that have their remaining traces smoothed away by the friendly talk of acquaintances in the aisles, or by the kindly inquiries of the porch. And yet for all but men of the rarest powers, or of a still more rare directness and simplicity of soul, the alternative is this, or obscurity and neglect. I have not courage to tell here, even by way of illustration, the things that I have heard from the most popular Pulpit in England—a Pulpit pressed upon and surrounded by vast crowds, not of the uneducated, but of all ranks of English society. And on the other hand, I am not competent to speak the words instinct with spiritual life, the truths struggling into imperfect utterance because of their greatness and simplicity, as with agony of soul, which on the same day I heard from a Pulpit surrounded only by a vast solitude, spoken to a few straggling listeners. From the crowd I retired, feeling that the power which had such splendid success was too mean for use. From the solitude I retired, feeling that the power I had experienced was of the highest that God can give, though it only reached a soul here and there."—Pp. 11, 12.

Mr. Thom may here refer to the coarse buffoon of Surrey Gardens as the occupant of the popular pulpit, and with him may design to put in contrast a refined spiritual instructor like Mr. J. J. Tayler. The same experience is to be found elsewhere. There are pulpit quacks in Liverpool, who easily get around them their thousands of hearers, where Mr. Thom has not hundreds or fifties. So in Manchester, the man who week after week fills the huge area of the Free-Trade Hall with an excited audience, is a youth who panders to the lowest taste by his slang and vulgar humour, and the least objectionable quality of whose utterances is their tumid and bombastical rant, fitted for the calibre of the attendants on a penny theatre. Mr. Thom rebukes his hearers for thinking or saying that they are in spiritual and intellectual culture in advance of other churches; but with such experiences before them, who can doubt or conceal the fact?—We have not time or space now to discuss with Mr. Thom the several matters on which we dissent from his views as given in these able sermons. We will only just indicate their nature. While the Bible is the source of man's religious ideas, *theology* as well as *religion* must form an element in pulpit instruction. Mr. Thom's practice is a confirmation of this necessity. The book must be in some degree explained (and few men better do this work than Mr. Thom), in order that its lessons may be understood and its spirit communicated. We would also express our dissent from Mr. Thom's view of the pulpit's being the only exclusive province of the minister of religion. The ministerial relation is, we believe, stripped of a most efficient arm, if it do not include the multifarious and touching duties of the *pastor*. The spiritual utterances of the pulpit come with ten-fold force to the hearts of people who have listened to the same wise and holy voice in the domestic circle, and especially in the chamber of sickness and the house of mourning. True it is that the pulpit has in some cases developed amazing power in the instance of men who have all but ignored pastoral duty. But this is not conclusive evidence. How much more might not those strong men have done, had they by pastoral duty won the affection and gratitude, as thoroughly as by pulpit power they extorted the admiration of their hearers! Mr. Thom, again, seems to us exclusive, and therefore somewhat in error, when he limits the higher

effects of religion to sympathy with that kind of mystical spiritualism of which the Unitarian pulpit of Liverpool is redolent. We know good and spiritual men too, who have founded their religious ideas on the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount and the other teachings of their Saviour, who feel embarrassed and distressed by modern mystical utterances—distressed because, respecting and admiring those who utter them, they fear some religious deficiencies in themselves when they feel an entire absence of sympathy. If we appreciate aright Mr. Thom's catholic spirit, he would be the last man to deny the religiousness of spirit of such disciples. However honest and earnest, Unitarians need not allow these differences of utterance and feeling and taste in their church to distress them. There were similar difficulties in apostolic churches, and Peter in the honesty of his heart complained of those "things hard to be understood" in the Epistles of Paul which were wrested to evil by the unstable.

---

*A Key to the Adulteration of our Daily Food.* Compiled by William Dalton. Pp. 184. London—Marlborough and Co. 1857.

That articles of food are adulterated to an alarming extent, was proved by practical and scientific witnesses who gave evidence on this subject before a Committee of the House of Commons in 1855. The result of that inquiry was a conclusion scarcely too strongly described by Mr. Dalton when he says, "The three kingdoms are emeshed in a net-work of secret poisonings and covert frauds." The difficulty of protecting the public in this matter by means of food-laws and the help of the exciseman and the constable, is so great, that we must rather trust to the watchful self-interest of the public to put down fraudulent dealers in the articles that constitute our food. A book like this is a very disagreeable kind of reading, and some of the incidents recorded in it are apt to haunt the mind and vitiate the palate by giving an imaginary *tang* to food really wholesome; but we fear, under the circumstances, it is a necessary evil. Men may as well be poisoned as starved; but when they learn (see p. 178) how tobacco and snuff are depraved and made the means of poisoning the smoker and the snuff-taker, they may perhaps think it the part of wisdom to avoid the use of such narcotics and stimulants. It is proved by Dr. Letheby that oxide and chromate of lead and bichromate of potash are not uncommon ingredients in snuff, and all three are unmistakably poisons.

---

*The Reason Why: a careful Collection of many Hundreds of Reasons for Things which, though generally believed, are imperfectly understood.*

This book may be useful as a means of inciting the reader to a full study of the subjects indicated in its pages; but the answers are too slight to give any but a superficial knowledge of the numerous scientific matters here introduced. The texts of Scripture placed at the top of each page are too frequently inappropriate to the subject therein discussed, and would therefore be better away.

# INTELLIGENCE.

## ANNUAL MEETING OF THE TRUSTEES OF MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

The seventy-second annual meeting of the Trustees was held in the Cross-Street chapel, Manchester, on Thursday, Jan. 21st. It was attended by upwards of 80 Trustees, amongst whom were Mr. James Heywood, President; Mr. J. A. Turner, M.P., and Rev. Dr. Hutton, Vice-Presidents; Mr. Mark Philips, Mr. R. N. Philips, M.P., Mr. W. R. Wood, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. Holbrook Gaskell, Mr. Robert Worthington, Mr. S. D. Darbishire, Mr. R. D. Darbishire, Mr. Samuel Robinson, Mr. Robert Heywood, Mr. John Grundy; Messrs. Avison, H. A. Bright, J. W. Lamport, George Melly, &c., of Liverpool; Messrs. A. Lupton and Joseph Lupton, of Leeds; Messrs. E. W. Field, S. Shaen, W. Shaen, Henry Enfield, J. C. Lawrence, of London; Mr. Leyson Lewis; and the following ministers—Revds. Dr. Beard, Joseph Ashton, Samuel Bache, John Colston, Thos. L. Marshall, D. Davis, Brooke Herford, W. Herford, C. W. Robberds, J. Robberds, Noah Jones, R. C. Jones, C. Beard, T. E. Poynting, John Wright, H. Green, Wm. Gaskell, J. Panton Ham, S. A. Steinthal, J. H. Thom, E. Higginson, J. H. Ryland and R. B. Aspland.

The chair was taken by the President, Mr. James Heywood. Letters were read from Rev. E. Kell, expressing his wish to vote by proxy for the resolutions to be proposed by Rev. Samuel Bache; from Mr. William Rathbone, of Liverpool, Rev. E. Talbot, of Tenterden, Mr. Joseph Munn, of Tenterden, Mr. Chappel, of Liverpool, Mr. Thomas Thornely, M.P., of Liverpool, Mr. Thomas Bolton, of Liverpool, Rev. E. Chapman and other Trustees resident in Bristol, deprecating the re-opening of the questions settled at the special meeting of Trustees in April last, and some of them objecting to Mr. Bache's proposed resolutions.—Mr. R. D. Darbishire, the Secretary, read the minutes of the proceedings of the past year both of the Committee and of the Trustees, and, when required, produced and read, in extenso, letters and other documents referred to in the minutes. At times a portion of the meeting expressed applause of or dissent from those documents which bore on matters of discussion and struggle during the year. The reading of the minutes, &c., occupied nearly an hour. At the close, Rev. Wm. Gaskell, as Chairman of the Committee, moved the confirmation of the minutes and proceedings. He said that he did it with very great pleasure, because he could say that, though he had sat on many Committees, he had never sat on one which shewed a more sincere desire to discharge its duties carefully and faithfully in the matters which came before it for decision. As every Trustee must be aware, the last year had been one peculiarly difficult and trying. It would be idle to attempt to conceal that there had been strong differences of opinion, and that they had occasionally led to some warmth of feeling. This circumstance had been most absurdly magnified by report in distant quarters. He could truly say that in his belief each and all of the Committee had had the same object in view, to adopt the measures best fitted to promote the true interests of the Institution. There might still remain differences of opinion with regard to the new professorial arrangements. But every one must now feel the truth of what had been expressed by Mr. Rathbone in his letter just read, that it would be most inexpedient to take any step which would have the effect of unsettling those arrangements, especially after the expression of opinion on the subject by so large a majority of the Trustees. It was only respectful to the body of the Trustees and to the Professors personally, that they should afford a fair trial to the new arrangements, and do what they could to give effect to them. Their Institution had in times past rendered, and was still capable of rendering, important service to the cause of free thought and pure theology. Instead, therefore, of frittering and wasting their energies on matters of little importance, they ought zealously to combine to place the Institution in a condition of prosperity and strength. He would conclude by expressing his strong conviction that it would be well for them not, by their proceedings that day, to re-open any of the questions settled by the vote of the Trustees at their recent special meeting.

Mr. Robert Heywood, of Bolton, seconded the motion.

Mr. Eddowes Bowman said that he owed it to the Secretaries, especially to Mr. Darbishire, to withdraw charges he had made in respect to two points, viz., the use of the plea of a financial necessity for reducing the staff of Professors, and the omission of certain minutes from the "Special Report." As to the first point, explanations had recently passed in Committee; and he was assured that the Secretary had not adopted the plea, and that it had no official sanction or authority. Under

these circumstances, though he regretted that it had not been at once officially disavowed, he would not persist for a moment in the charge of insincerity against Mr. Darbishire. As to the omission of the minutes, he still thought it would have been better if the materials for judgment had been given without selection; but he would on this point also withdraw all imputations, and express regret at having made them with too much acrimony.

Mr. R. D. Darbishire here said that his co-secretary and himself were satisfied with the concessions made, and they thought that no Trustee need carry the matter farther.

Rev. J. H. Thom complained that while Mr. Bowman said he would not re-open the charges he had made, he had brought a new charge against Mr. Martineau of want of delicacy in intefering when he knew that his own son was thought of for the Hebrew Lectureship. That was not the case. If Mr. Martineau's letter were to be regarded as true, that was not fact. Mr. Martineau never intefered after his son was named. After some further remarks, Mr. Thom said the Trustees must understand that by the vote they were about to give, confirming the proceedings of the Committee, they would solemnly confirm the verdict which acquitted Mr. Martineau of every charge brought against him.

This led to a long, desultory and at times very warm discussion, partaking too much of the interlocutory character to be reported. After nearly an hour spent in this manner, the resolution was put and carried by a very large majority, some of the Trustees, however, not voting at all.

The Treasurer's report was then read by Mr. R. N. Philips, M.P. It stated the annual subscriptions were £1168, and the whole current receipts of the year were £2354, an increase of about £189 on the receipts of the previous year. On the other hand, the expenditure of the year amounted to £2493, being an excess over the expenditure of the previous year of £446, and an excess over the actual income of nearly £140. On the motion of Mr. Ainsworth, seconded by Mr. Ewart, the Treasurer's report was adopted.

Mr. R. D. Darbishire then read the Address of the Committee, as follows:

"The Committee of Manchester New College, in presenting their annual report to the Trustees, desire, in the first place, to refer to the circumstances under which they were elected in January, 1857. The Professor of Critical and Exegetical Theology had offered the resignation of his chair, which had been accepted and was to take effect in the following June; and the Trustees, at their annual meeting, delegated to the Committee then appointed the difficult task of supplying his place. In a Special Report, dated March 12, 1857, the Trustees were informed of the changes and appointments which up to that time it had been judged advisable to make, and the reasons which led to their completion. But a considerable difference of opinion as to arrangements made having been manifested among the supporters of the College, both before and after the publication of that Report, a special meeting of Trustees was summoned, and held in Cross-Street chapel, Manchester, on April 16th, which, by a large majority in a meeting of unprecedented numbers, formally adopted the Report, and testified its unabated confidence in the Committee and its full acceptance of their measures. The Principal and Professor Martineau, in the scheme of studies which, at the request of the Committee, they submitted, together with the joint acceptance of their new duties, strongly recommended that instruction in Hebrew should be given by a Tutor well versed in recent Hebrew scholarship, and possessing, in addition, an acquaintance with Chaldee, Syriac, and the cognate dialects. This communication was accompanied by a letter from Mr. Tayler, in which, regarding the salary of £550 voted to him by the Committee as a remuneration amply covering the whole department of Biblical Theology and Ecclesiastical History, inclusive of Hebrew, he offered to the Committee the sum of £100 per annum for the purpose of procuring the necessary instruction in Hebrew. The Committee, at Mr. Tayler's suggestion, placed the nomination of a Lecturer in the Hebrew language and literature, in the hands of himself and the Rev. John Kenrick, Visitor of the College, who, in July last, recommended Mr. Russell Martineau, M.A., for appointment to that office. After examining the high testimonials from various English and foreign scholars which accompanied this recommendation, the Committee, on the 23rd of July, unanimously elected Mr. R. Martineau. As the province of Hebrew teacher forms part of that of the Professor of Theology, it is understood that he will receive directions from the latter gentleman as to the books to be read, and all other points connected with his duties. And the Committee confidently rely on Mr. R. Martineau's known proficiency in and enthusiastic devotion to Oriental scholarship, aided by the Principal's judicious guidance, to produce among the pupils of Manchester New College a genuine conviction of the necessity and value of these studies.

"The Committee are aware that the arrangements which they have thus completed for the provision of theological instruction in the College, do not meet with the unanimous approval of the Trustees. But they believe that, under circumstances of unusual difficulty, and in the presence of great difference of opinion, they have been faithful to the principles in accordance with which the College has always been governed, and are confident that the appointments which, after careful and anxious deliberation, they have thought it right to make, will conduce to the efficacy and success of the Institution. It will not be deemed inopportune or out of place, that your Committee should once more briefly state the general principles which have determined their treatment of the difficult questions which have engaged their attention during the past year. They received from their predecessors in office the charge of Manchester New College as an Institution in which students for the Christian ministry among Non-subscribing Dissenters were instructed in University learning, without being required to subscribe any test or confession of faith. They were assured by the history of the Institution that its teachers had always been selected without reference to any peculiar views which they might hold, as men of erudition and impartiality, who were able and willing to place before their scholars the results of theological research, and would leave them to form religious opinions for themselves. They believed that in the genuine love of truth and freedom from ecclesiastical rancour and prejudice which have always honourably distinguished the ministers and laymen educated in the College, they perceived the natural results of adherence to those time-honoured principles; in their attachment to which they have been strengthened by observation of the serious evils which have been produced in other similar institutions by the attempt to impose a test of religious belief on Professors and students. And being thus convinced that the principle of unrestricted liberty of theological research is the only safeguard of the future welfare and efficiency of the College, and would be accepted as such by the great majority of its supporters, they have placed the instruction of its students in the hands of those gentlemen who, for their learning, candour and ability in religious investigation, seemed best qualified to encourage in them the formation of individual convictions.

"The practical application of their principles in the discipline of the College as an educational institution is admirably stated by the Principal in the following passage extracted from his Address at the opening of the session:

"'The wish has been sometimes expressed, though not, I think, very often, that our Institution should avow itself more decidedly Unitarian; that as its teachers are Unitarian, and its pupils go out into the world Unitarian, it is only keeping up false appearances to assert that no particular theological system is taught within its walls. This feeling arises, I conceive, from misconception. The case appears to me to stand thus. If I am asked what my individual opinions are, I should not hesitate to reply, Unitarian; and that they are so must appear, unless I suppress every utterance of conviction in the course of my teaching; but not—and here is the important distinction—not as opinions *à priori* assumed, which I am previously understood as engaged to support, but as the result of that free and unfettered interpretation of Scripture which is the hereditary privilege of our Academy. Unitarianism in any form is not the *condition*, but the *consequence*, of our teaching, flowing from the application of the principles on which it is based. In proportion to the strength of our conviction that Unitarianism is in accordance with the teaching of Scripture, will be our willingness to leave it to this issue. We are not pledged beforehand to the adoption of any particular type of doctrine or any particular interpretation of certain passages of Scripture. Theology is not a dead but a living science; and it is fed by living sciences, philology, history, archæology, and that still higher science which embraces the laws of human thought and their relation to the Eternal Mind. Our Unitarianism may hereafter grow and expand and develope itself, as it has done in times past, to meet new wants and satisfy higher aspirations of the soul; but this it cannot do if it is to be arrested and stereotyped in any particular form—if it is to be an understood thing beforehand, 'So you must teach, and so our young men must learn.' I do not of course mean that any Institution could stand that did not rest on some fundamental assumptions, that was purely and absolutely condition*less*. That we rear an Institution for theological education at all, that some are appointed to teach and that others come to learn, implies that we have deep religious wants, that Christianity satisfies those wants, that in Scripture we have the outline of a divine economy of things, a kingdom of God, which corresponds to our dim perceptions of what should be the moral order of the world, and furnishes the best solution of the moral chaos in

which we seem to live. It is the object of the education pursued in this place to develope these elementary convictions and trusts of religious natures into clear and assured belief, by the study of general religious phenomena and of the great histories and teachings of Scripture. If any one entering among us with a sincere desire to learn and believe, should find himself on completing his course of education unsatisfied at last on essential points, the being and character of God or the divine life and doctrine of Christ,—for him, it is true, our Institution will have failed in its destined effect, and he cannot minister in our churches. But how should we have mended the matter by saying beforehand, If you enter here, it is on condition that you hold and preach a certain doctrine on quitting us? It is clear that such a course could only have one of two results; it must either prevent all real inquiry, or it must make a hypocrite. The result of every education is to a certain extent an experiment. We best provide for a successful issue, by treating the young mind while it is passing through this state of serious probation with a generous confidence and a wise tenderness, by inspiring it with a supreme love of truth and rectitude, by allowing their natural course and working to all honest doubts and conscientious difficulties and never brow-beating them into hollow suppression, by inculcating above all things, in its exercise of the undoubted right of mental freedom, the spirit of reverence and humility. My belief is, that in the vast majority of cases, pure and earnest minds under such treatment would end their inquiries in deep and serious faith; for religion is a natural want of the soul, and for most men no form of it so completely satisfies that want as Christianity. Within the limits indicated, as involved in the essential conditions of an Institution for teaching Christian theology, the whole field of scriptural criticism, exegesis, doctrine, history, lies open before us here to the freest investigation. If we believe Unitarianism to be a scriptural truth, we can have no fear that it will not in most instances, on all essential points, result from the exercise of a free search into Scripture; but if any one going through our course thoughtfully and diligently should arrive, in the exercise of the liberty we concede to him, at some conclusions differing materially from the prevalent Unitarianism, we could not say of him that he had abused the purpose of our Institution, if he went out into the world full of faith and love, earnest to do good to the souls of men in the spirit of Christ. He might meet wants which another cast of mind would not have met; and so our means of good would be multiplied in the world by the very diversity of the products which our freedom allows. Such I understand to be the principles of Manchester New College. I embrace them with the cordial approval of my heart and my head.'

"In this same spirit Mr. Tayler adds, in the name of his colleague as well as for himself, 'There is no interest on earth to which we are so entirely devoted, none to which we attach such unspeakable importance, as the pure religion of Jesus Christ; that we look on its spirit of self-sacrificing love and unquestioning self-surrender to the Divine will, as the sole agency which can relieve our human world from the load of selfishness and sin which crushes it; and that if there be one object to which we earnestly desire to consecrate the remnant of our days, it is to assist by our labours here in disseminating that spirit through society; more especially in that narrower sphere of influence with which we are denominationally connected, to assist in infusing a deeper and more earnest religious life into those churches of our land which possess such opportunities of self-developement in their hereditary privilege of spiritual freedom, and to which we are both so strongly bound by the recollections of our early years and the traditions of a pious ancestry.'

"The Committee especially desire to call the attention of the Trustees to the scheme of studies in the College, now for the first time drawn out in all its details, and published in this Report. They believe that, taken in conjunction with the instruction provided in the classes of University College, it constitutes the most complete and systematic preparation for the Christian ministry afforded by any English institution. With regard to the more peculiarly Biblical and Theological portions of it, they cannot better express their views than in the words of the Principal. 'The New Testament is the fountain of Christian truth. The New Testament is to be the central attraction of our thought and interest in this place.' Every provision has been made for historical and critical illustration of the Bible; and while the students of Manchester New College are taught to go to the Scriptures for the truths and motives which will enable them to discharge worthily the duties of Christian ministers, it is the hope of the Committee that the philosophical discipline of the College will be effectual to produce in them the clearness of conception and exactness of expression which are needful to all who propose to

enforce abstract truths and duties. The Committee are convinced that, in the hands of the present Professors, both of whom are distinguished for exact study of the Scriptures, as well as for habits of philosophical thought, the reputation of Manchester New College as a School of enlightened biblical criticism and the Alma Mater of earnest, pious and able ministers, will suffer no diminution.

"Your Committee have to report that the plan of Tutorship which at the commencement of last session they adopted as an experiment in conjunction with University Hall has met with only partial success. They have re-appointed Mr. John Bridge, M.A., to the office of Mathematical Tutor; but after some consideration have resolved not to elect a Tutor in Classics. It is hoped that the graduates of the College may, with the advice and assistance of the Principal, be able to afford all needful help to their younger fellow-students. The want of sound elementary instruction in the candidates for admission to the College is, however, still felt to oppose an obstacle to the attainment of as high a standard of classical and mathematical scholarship as might be wished. The Committee have again revised the regulations for the admission of students, and with reference to this difficulty feel that they may rely on their strict enforcement by the Professors of the College.

"Many of the Trustees are aware that, since the issue of the last Report, the Senate of the University of London has sought to introduce into the new Charter about to be granted by Her Majesty, a clause to authorize the admission and examination for degrees of candidates unprovided with certificates of a previous Collegiate training. Believing that this measure would tend materially to check the progress of sound learning, and would render less valuable the privilege of affiliation with the University, the Trustees at their meeting in June last, passed resolutions deprecating its adoption, placing on record at the same time their recognition of the advantage of the proposed examinations, provided only the certificates of success were marked in such a manner as not to cause confusion between them and the ordinary signs of University training. In accordance with this resolution, the Committee organized a deputation which had an interview with Sir George Grey at the Home Office on the 13th of August. An attempt made by the Committee, in conjunction with the authorities of Owens and the Lancashire Independent Colleges, to see Lord Granville, while in Manchester, on this subject, was unsuccessful.

"The Committee regret to report that the Rev. R. B. Aspland, M.A., resigned in March last the office of Secretary to the College, which he had held for twelve years. Mr. Aspland's great assiduity and success in the performance of his duties, and the unwearied zeal which he has always shewn in promoting the interests of the College, demand from your Committee this public expression of their sorrow that they can no longer have the benefit of his services. The Committee appointed the Rev. Charles Beard, B.A., to supply his place for the remainder of the year.

"During the past session, the number of divinity students has been 14, viz., Mr. R. B. Drummond, in his sixth year; Mr. Thomas Holland, Mr. Wm. Blazeby and Mr. R. A. Gibson, in their fifth year; Mr. Charles Upton, Mr. Jas. Drummond and Mr. John Lloyd, in their fourth year; Mr. Percy Bakewell, Mr. Geo. Heaviside and Mr. Joseph Dare, in their third year; Mr. Frederic Mitchell, in his second year; Mr. Edward Howse, Mr. J. D. Smyth and Mr. James Pillars, in their first year. In addition to these gentlemen, Mr. William Matthews was admitted free to lectures during the whole, and Mr. A. M'Dougall and Mr. Richard Shelley during a part, of the session. Mr. Edwin Smith, formerly a divinity student in the College and now a Hibbert scholar, residing in University Hall, was also permitted to attend a portion of Professor Martineau's courses. Mr. R. B. Drummond has left the College, having completed his academical studies.

"The annual examination was held in University Hall on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, June 22nd, 23rd and 24th. The Latin prize offered by the Principal of the College to students of Manchester New College and University Hall, was adjudged by the examiners, Mr. T. E. Kebbell and Mr. W. A. Case, to Mr. Joseph Dare, divinity student in his third year. An address was delivered to the students at the close of the examination by Rev. John Kenrick, M.A., Visitor; and the usual soirée of the friends of the College was held on the evening of Thursday, June 26, in the rooms of University Hall, which were kindly lent for the purpose.

"On the examination for the B.A. degree in the University of London, held in October last, four students of the College, viz., Mr. Upton, Mr. Dare, Mr. Heaviside and Mr. Bakewell, obtained places in the class list. The Committee also desire to call attention to the following list of prizes and certificates gained by pupils of Manchester New College at the examination held in University College at the close of the session 1856-57. Mr. Dare obtained the

fourth certificate in the senior Latin, and the fourth (equal with two others) in the senior Greek. Mr. J. D. H. Smyth gained the first prize and the first certificate in the junior Latin, and the second prize (certificate equal with one other) in junior Greek. Mr. Percy Bakewell gained the eleventh certificate in senior Greek. Mr. Howse gained the fifth certificate in the junior Latin, and the fifth certificate in the junior Greek, and the third certificate (equal with another) in the higher junior Mathematics.

"The Trustees of the Hibbert Fund, at their examination in Nov. last, admitted Mr. W. Blazeby as a probationer under the Trust on a limited exhibition.

"The students upon the foundation for the session 1857-8 are fifteen: Mr. Thos. Holland, Mr. W. Blazeby, Mr. R. H. Gibson, Mr. C. Upton, Mr. Jas. Drummond, Mr. J. Lloyd, Mr. P. Bakewell, Mr. Geo. Heaviside, Mr. J. Dare, Mr. F. Mitchell, Mr. E. Howse, Mr. J. D. H. Smyth, and Mr. J. Pillars, mentioned above, and Mr. H. E. Dowson (second year), and Mr. W. J. Smyth (first year), who were admitted at the meeting of the Trustees held on June 26th last. At the same time Mr. W. C. Coupland was admitted as a divinity student in the third year on his own foundation; Mr. W. Matthews continues to attend the College courses free of charge; and Mr. Edwin Smith has again received permission to join one of Professor Martineau's classes.

"The Committee feel great satisfaction in referring to the fact, that the number of students at present attending the full theological course, viz. 17, is greater than in any session since the year 1828. They have also much pleasure in being able to report, that during the past year they have received an unusual accession of new subscribers. At the same time, while the income of the College has been diminished by the death of many old and liberal supporters, the increased number of students, joined with the fact that the exhibition to each foundation student has been considerably augmented since the removal of the College to London, imposes a new and heavy charge upon its funds, and the Committee regret to announce a deficit of £140 upon the late financial year. They trust, therefore, that the appeal for pecuniary support which before long it will be their duty to make to the Non-subscribing Dissenters of England, will meet with a prompt and liberal response. For while they cordially wish success to a sister Institution, which has for its object the education of missionaries to the ignorant and neglected of our countrymen, they believe that they see in the gradual advances towards a scientific study of theology, and in the consequent increasing activity of religious thought prevalent in all English churches, indications that the complete theological education of our ministers is more than ever necessary, if they are to maintain an honourable place in the van of social progress. They cannot believe that an Institution which aims at producing this completeness with the utmost economy compatible with full efficiency, will be allowed to languish for want of pecuniary support.

"It is with great regret that, in concluding their annual Address, your Committee refer to a paper signed by one of themselves, Mr. Eddowes Bowman, impugning the conduct of Professor Martineau in relation to the appointment of Mr. Russell Martineau to the Hebrew Lectureship, which has been printed and circulated among the Trustees and Subscribers to the College. After reviewing the testimonials to Mr. R. Martineau's learning and capacity, and reading various letters from Mr. Kenrick, Mr. Tayler and Mr. Martineau, the Committee by a majority of votes came to the conclusion that the documents laid before them afforded a complete refutation of the charges against Mr. Martineau."

Mr. William Shaen moved that the Address be adopted and printed. He disclaimed all desire unduly to press on the convictions of the minority. He regretted to hear the charge of tyranny, for which he thought there was no justification in their proceedings, that day brought against the majority. They had no desire to re-open in any shape whatever, past discussions. They were content that the whole matter should remain as it was left by the Trustees. The first step taken was the circulation of Mr. Bowman's letter. That letter appeared to him to contain the most unfounded imputations upon a gentleman whom the Trustees had placed in a position of authority. The wording of the resolution which he moved did, he believed, pledge every one who voted for it to agreement with the verdict of the Committee on the issue raised by Mr. Bowman. He regretted that the Report did not contain any reference to a subject of some importance, which was discussed at the June meeting of Trustees, the necessity of increased attention to elocution on the part of the students. This was an acknowledged want in our pulpits, and there was on the part of the friends of the College a wish that more attention should be paid to the means by which it might be supplied.

Mr. Holbrook Gaskell seconded the resolution.

Rev. J. H. Ryland thought the passage in the Address which declared the principle of the Institution to be one of freedom, was unnecessary. They all agreed to the principle of theological freedom.

Rev. Charles Beard defended the Address. The passage objected to by Mr. Ryland was deliberately introduced in justification of the proceedings of the Committee. There were, he knew, many theories afloat to account for the proceedings adopted in the appointment of the Professors. One was, that there was an organized plan to eject Mr. Smith and place Mr. Martineau in office. He should not stay to confute that hypothesis. Another hypothesis was, that the appointments had been made by a certain party desirous of promoting the prevalence of a particular school of theology. They who held this theory supposed that, in raising the cry of danger to religious liberty, the promoters of the recent arrangement had done the very thing they complained that others were attempting to do. Any one who knew the constitution of the Committee of the College, would know that this charge could have no foundation. It was composed of gentlemen of very various ways of thinking in theology. Two or three amongst them were indeed very proud to refer to Mr. Martineau as their friend and teacher. But many of the Committee were the farthest possible from feeling sympathy with Mr. Martineau's peculiar opinions. They had simply looked out for the best man, and when they found him they invested him with office without regard to any particular religious opinions. The struggle that had been going on was a very unfortunate one. It was an internecine war, in which the hand of brother was raised against brother. He knew the gentlemen opposed to them had an attachment as firm as their own to the principles of religious liberty. They had agreed in principle, while they differed as to the best means of securing the application of it. He wished to remind the gentlemen of the minority of the danger to which the principle they valued was exposed. There was a party among the English Nonconformists who were tired of non-subscription, and who said, Why, if we are Unitarians, do we not avow it and openly teach Unitarianism? Knowing that this tendency of thought does exist and is spreading, he thought it right to give a distinct re-assertion of the English Presbyterian principle. It was a most important thing that they should be true to this principle. Other religious denominations say that, in order to secure the succession of pastors of their faith, they must train up students in the recognition and acceptance from the beginning of their particular articles of belief. Unitarians said they were content to train their youths simply in the love and search of truth. Other denominations say they must teach Arminianism or Calvinism; Unitarians say, We will only teach our youth to study the Scriptures fearlessly and impartially, believing that in most cases such a study will make men Unitarians, but content whether it do so or not, if they faithfully seek for truth and honestly avow what they in their hearts believe.

Other speakers followed, but we have no space left for a particular report. It may, however, be well to state that the gentlemen who composed the minority disavowed all intention or wish of offering opposition to the declared will of the Trustees. They acquiesced in what they could not approve. The experiment must now be tested by its results. If the theological instruction given to their students made them able ministers of Christ's holy gospel, the minority would be convinced, and would avow that their opposition was wrong. If, on the other hand, the results of a mystical theological training realized in any considerable degree the fears of those who had resisted the present arrangements,—if many wandered to other churches, under the influence of the plea that opinions were altogether unimportant, —and if others gave way to scepticism, and stopped short of or left the Christian ministry,—then the Trustees would see the absolute necessity of making a change that would re-unite all the friends of the Institution.

Some omissions in the Address, moved by Mr. Ryland, were rejected, and the Address adopted by a very large majority.

Rev. Samuel Bache then moved the resolutions of which he had given notice, and in doing so distinctly and emphatically disclaimed the slightest intention of disturbing the existing arrangements of the College, or of introducing an element of discord. He only wished to preserve inviolate free thought and speech. His resolutions were—

"1. That Mr. E. W. Field's first resolution, at the special meeting of Trustees in Manchester, on 16th April, 1857, is disapproved, and the following resolution substituted for it, viz.: That this meeting having heard with satisfaction the Minutes of the Committee Meeting of the 3rd April, in reference to their entry on the 12th March last, of a Protest from individual Trustees, heartily commends that 'respect for the opinions of the Trustees who

signed the Protest,' and that 'consideration for the feelings of the minority of the Committee' which determined them to make this entry; concurs with them in regarding this entry as exceptional only; and trusts to the candour and forbearance of the Trustees in general, the exercise of their right of Protest, and to the judgment of the Committee for the time being, the rejection or recognition of whatever Protest may be presented to them.

"2. That Mr. E. W. Field's second resolution be rescinded, and the following resolution be substituted for it, viz.: That this Institution is founded for the sole purpose of giving University Learning to Students for the Christian Ministry amongst Non-subscribing Dissenters, without test or confession of faith, and not for the purpose of instruction in the peculiar doctrines of any sect: and that an inquiry into the intellectual and moral aptitudes, habits, and attainments of any gentleman who may be proposed to fill any Professorship in the Institution, for the purpose of securing a due provision for every department of Theological instruction and culture, so that the views of no important school of religious thought shall be excluded, involves no violation of this fundamental principle, but is absolutely necessary to the accomplishment of the very objects of the Institution."

Mr. J. A. Turner, M.P., seconded the resolutions. They were opposed by Mr. Field, Mr. R. N. Philips, M.P., Mr. Samuel Robinson, Mr. Ainsworth and Rev. J. H. Thom; and were eventually lost by very large majorities.—The election of officers was then proceeded with. Mr. J. Pemberton Heywood was elected President, and Mr. Mark Philips was made one of the Vice-Presidents. Rev. J. H. Thom, Mr. J. Grundy and Mr. Shaen, were added to the Committee. The other officers were re-elected, and the meeting, which had lasted more than five hours, broke up after a cordial vote of thanks to the President. About 40 of the Trustees afterwards dined together, and the friendly and cordial spirit in which the proceedings of the day terminated, formed a pleasant contrast to what had preceded, and, if it were not an omen of an approaching return to unanimity among the friends of Manchester New College, was at least a proof that serious differences of opinion do not interfere with the relations of personal regard and friendship.

---

### UNITARIAN HOME MISSIONARY BOARD.

The third annual examination of this Institution was held on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, Jan. 25th, 26th and 27th, in the rooms of the Institution, Marsden Street, Manchester. More than common interest was evinced on the occasion, from the circumstance that seven students at the close of this term finish their academical course, and will then enter on the duties of the ministry and the Mission.—On Monday, Jan. 25, there were present in the course of the day, Mr. Ivie Mackie, the Mayor of Manchester; Mr. Jas. Heywood; Mr. J. C. Lawrence, of London; Mr. Benjamin Heape and Mr. Eddowes Bowman, of Manchester; Rev. J. Panton Ham, Rev. J. H. Hutton, Rev. J. Wright, Rev. W. M'Kean, Rev. Mr. Squier, Rev. R. W. Whitelegg, Rev. R. B. Aspland, Rev. T. E. Poynting.

The first class consisted of nearly the whole of the students. Rev. Dr. Beard stated, that in preparing the written answers about to be read, no books or notes had been used by the pupils. The subject of the examination was the Apostolic Age; the text-book used was "Schaff's History of the Apostolic Age." The paper had eight questions relating to the preparation for Christianity in the history of the world, and specially in relation to Greek civilization, Platonism, Roman civilization, Stoicism, Judaism, &c.; and six questions relating to the founding of the Christian church. The answers read varied in accuracy and fulness, but were generally very good; and some of them were, in fact, brief but excellent essays on some of the subjects already named, and on the events of the day of Pentecost, on the history of the Christian name, and on the history of the Apostle Paul.—The second hour was occupied by Rev. W. Gaskell in the examination of the class in the English language. The examination (viva voce) was a very searching one, comprehending the history of the language, tracing words to their origin, and shewing their primitive force and meaning.—Rev. Dr. Beard next examined the senior class in Scripture exposition, taking the first chapters of the Book of Genesis. The Principal stated that it had been his object first of all to make his pupils acquainted with the literature and ideas of the Old Testament. Having done this, the class had taken up the Pentateuch and analyzed its contents. The students were not acquainted with the original Hebrew; but it was hoped that the instruction given would shew them how much valuable information might be acquired by the mere English scholar by application to the proper sources. Very full and interesting answers—some admirable for their correctness—were given in answer to nine questions founded on the Mosaic history of the Creation.—After an interval

devoted to refreshment, Rev. W. Gaskell took the junior and middle class in the Greek Testament, taking passages from various chapters in the first Gospel, which were translated at sight by the students, and answers given respecting syntax and etymology. Some of the class had only begun the study of Greek at the commencement of the session. The proficiency was remarkable, considering the limited opportunities enjoyed.—The proceedings of the day were brought to a close by Rev. Francis Bishop examining the whole students of the Board on the subject of Christian Education. Answers, previously prepared, were read to a series (the paper contained twenty) of questions, embracing the history of religious education in the Christian church from the time of the early Christians to the present day.

The examination was resumed on Tuesday, Jan. 26th, in the presence of many of the gentlemen named as in attendance the previous day, of Mr. H. A. Bright and some others. The morning was occupied by an examination in writing of the senior students on Unitarian Theology. The examination was competitive; a prize, Lardner's Works (handsomely bound), having been offered by Mr. H. A. Bright, of Liverpool, for the best answers given in writing to a series of questions prepared by himself, and submitted to them at the time of examination without previous intimation of their nature. The paper included twelve questions on the following subjects:—the connection between Religion and Theology; the Unity and Goodness of God; the Writers and Genuineness of the New Testament; the doctrine of the Holy Spirit; explanation of "Saviour," "Mediator," and other terms applied to Christ; explanation of the Trinitarian Proof-texts, John x. 30, 33; argument for Christianity from the Miracles recorded in the Gospels; the Pauline doctrine of Justification by Faith, and how it differs from that of Luther and modern "Evangelical" Churches; Resurrection of the Body as distinguished from the Resurrection of the Flesh; meaning of the terms "Prophecy" and "Prophet;" Hebrew Prophecies of Christianity; the Apostles' Creed; and the origin of the doctrine of the "Vicarious Atonement," and its growth up to the time of Anselm. The answers were not read aloud, but were inspected by the friends of the Institution present. They indicated on the part of the writers considerable theological information, and the power of rapid and tolerably accurate composition. The result of the competition will be gathered from the Committee's Report.—After an interval, the work of the examination was resumed by Rev. F. Bishop, with the class of Political Economy. The text-book used was Newman's Lectures,—a work which, while in the main sound in its economic theories, more than most books on the subject defines the moral limits that should be observed in the doctrines of Political Economy. The answers, previously written, comprehended a wide range of economic subjects, especially those discussed with the deepest interest by intelligent working men. This examination was highly satisfactory.—The business of the day ended with an examination by Rev. Dr. Beard on Christian Doctrine. Portions were read from answers prepared at three private examinations. The course now brought to a close had three objects—1, to prove that Christ was an historical personage; 2, that he was a spiritual reality; 3, to shew the value of that reality. The answers were very full, and such as would satisfy Unitarian Christians resting their faith on a scriptural basis.

In the evening, the friends of the Missionary Board assembled in the supper-room of the Free-Trade Hall for a social soirée. There was a brilliant assemblage of about 500 persons. The chair was ably filled by the Mayor of Manchester, who has been from its foundation an earnest friend of this Institution. Music, conversation and speeches, diversified the amusements of the evening. Among the speakers, in addition to the Chairman, were Mr. Jas. Heywood, Mr. J. A. Turner, M.P., Mr. S. Greg, Mr. J. C. Lawrence, Rev. J. H. Hutton, Rev. W. M'Kean, Rev. J. P. Ham, Rev. F. Bishop, Rev. S. A. Steinthal and Mr. H. A. Bright. Mr. Broome, Mr. Squier and Mr. Binns, three of the students who have finished their course, were also called up. The proceedings lasted several hours and were of an interesting character.

On Wednesday, Jan. 27, the examination was brought to a close, Mr. Gaskell examining the senior class in the Greek Testament and in Roman History, also the classes in English Literature and English History. Dr. Beard took the classes of Hebrew Archæology and Scripture Exposition (1 Cor. xv. and Romans).—The whole of the examination closed with an address from the Principal and the announcement of the prizes. Mr. H. A. Bright himself presented to Mr. Squier the prize so honourably won by him in the competitive examination.

In the evening, the annual meeting of the members and friends of the Board was held. We cannot, on account of the advanced state of the month, do more than give the Committee's Report, a document entitled to the serious attention of the Unitarian public:

"In presenting their annual Report, the Committee have pleasure in calling attention to the fact, that the Institution has now been in existence long enough for the students who entered at its commencement to have gone through the entire course of three years' instruction, and that there is thus furnished in the men now leaving us to pursue their labours in the world, the first fruits of our exertions. To these men the Committee look with hope, as likely to prove an encouraging evidence of the result to be expected from the course of training pursued under the Board.

"The students during the past year have been 18; Mr. Stone, who commenced his studies as a first-year student, having been compelled by ill health to retire very early in the session. Of these 18, Messrs. Broome, Binns, Harrop, Squier, Hopkinson, Robinson and M'Kean, have now completed their course. Mr. Broome has accepted an invitation to succeed Mr. Vidler in conducting the Chapel-Street branch of the London Domestic Mission. Mr. Squier is about to settle as minister at Preston. Mr. Hopkinson has received an invitation to Merthyr Tydfil; and Mr. M'Kean is to become an assistant to his father, Rev. W. M'Kean, of Oldbury. All these gentlemen take with them to their several new spheres of labour, the sincere esteem and hearty good wishes of the Tutors and of the Committee, who feel convinced that, in the case of each of them, good natural powers and an earnest desire to be useful have been cultivated and developed by the religious, intellectual and practical instructions they have received, and that they are thus fitted, if they continue to be earnest and persevering, to reflect credit on the Board, by becoming successful labourers in the cause of Christian truth and righteousness.

"As some inquiry may be excited by the fact here noticed, that only one of the students of the Board has been called to decided missionary work, the Committee would beg to remind the friends of the Institution and the Unitarian public generally, that it is impossible that all the students as they leave should be called to the work of domestic missionaries until Unitarian missionary stations are more numerous in the country. But one principal aim and hope of the supporters of this Institution has always been, that its existence and operations may serve to cultivate the missionary spirit among us, and so lead to the establishment of many new missionary stations. And the Committee anticipate with some confidence like results from the training which the students of this Board have received. They carry with them, it is believed, not merely an acquaintance with missionary labour, but that desire to engage in it, and that deep interest in its aims and fruits, which will render their several congregations new centres of missionary life.

"The students admitted for the year 1858 are Messrs. Heywood, Fox, Rushton, Euchus, George, Wilkinson, Beaumont and W. Smith, in the third year; Messrs. Biss, Strut and Robinson, in the second year; and Messrs. Mitchell and M'Masters in the first year. The Committee are of opinion that fifteen students should be the maximum admitted, in addition to the Cradley students, who are at present Messrs. George and M'Masters.

"The Library, which was commenced in 1856, has been considerably augmented. The Committee acknowledge, with cordial thanks, valuable donations by Rev. J. Colston, by Mrs. Robberds from the library of the late Rev. J. G. Robberds, and by the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. Further presents of suitable books are respectfully solicited.

"S. Sharpe, Esq., has again given £5 in two prizes for Biblical scholarship. These have been adjudged, the first to Mr. Binns, the second to Mr. Fox. A gentleman has also given £5 as a prize for the best written answers to questions relating to "The Theology and Ecclesiastical History of the Unitarian Church." The examination was conducted by Dr. Beard, Mr. Gaskell and the donor, and the prize has been gained by Mr. Squier. To the donors of these prizes the Committee present their sincere thanks.

"The rooms in Marsden Street have been in use throughout the year, and are found convenient for their purpose.

"The financial report will shew a deficiency on the account for the current year of £241. 0*s.* 9*d.* The amount at the credit of the donation account is also reduced by the sum of £90. 16*s.*, making the actual excess in expenditure over the income of the year, £331. 16*s.* 9*d.* It may be noticed, however, on this head, that many additional and exceptional expenses have been incurred this year, in fitting up the rooms in Marsden Street and in furnishing a Library, which are not likely to occur again.

"The Committee are not conscious of any lavish expenditure, the number of students having been greater than in any previous year. The cost of 18 students in 1857 has been about £1100, while that of 15 students in 1856 was £957. 15*s.* 6*d.*; and the subscriptions have increased from £811. 15*s.* 6*d.* to £830. 1*s.* 3*d.* Several

members of the Committee have been actively engaged in canvassing for new subscriptions, and in some instances with considerable success. The Committee believe that, when the times are more favourable for the purpose, a moderate effort will raise the subscription list to an amount fully adequate to the average annual expenditure."

The whole of these very interesting proceedings closed in the evening with a religious service at Cross-Street chapel, when the students were addressed by Rev. W. H. Channing. The eloquent preacher especially addressed his earnest and affectionate counsels to the students who had completed their academical term, and were prepared to begin a course of active ministerial and missionary duty. The devotional service was conducted by Rev. W. Gaskell.

---

HARVARD COLLEGE, AMERICA.

The prosperity of this noble institution is cheering, and may suggest some useful topics of thought and emulation to the friends of university learning and free religious study in this country. The Theological department of the College is under the control of our Unitarian friends, who, paying due respect to the state of opinion in their denomination, in recently selecting two Professors, one of Systematic Theology, the other of Ecclesiastical History, selected one from each of the two schools of religious thought which exist in America as well as in this country. The consequence of this wise and catholic proceeding is, that the College is sustained by the approbation and hearty goodwill of all classes of Unitarians, as well as by the truly liberal of all sects and parties. Some of the facts disclosed in the following report will be read with interest :

*Harvard College—Treasurer's Statement.*

"We have received the annual statement of the Treasurer of Harvard College, for the year ending August 31, 1857. It is the final report of William T. Andrews, Esq., who resigned the office last autumn. We copy his remarks introducing the statement of receipts and expenditures :

"It will appear from the following statement of the financial condition and transactions of Harvard College for the past year, that the receipts from the ordinary sources of income have been sufficient to meet the expenditures and leave a small surplus, and that we have to be grateful for many instances of bounty on the part of her friends to aid and encourage her in the future.

"Messrs. Ticknor & Fields have very liberally placed in the University Library copies of all their publications, amounting during the year to a hundred volumes.

"Uriah A. Boyden, Esq., who the last year gave five hundred dollars for two prizes for mathematical essays, has this year added one hundred dollars more to furnish another prize for a performance of very high merit, which would have otherwise failed of suitable recognition.

"The very valuable Theological Library, principally the donation of Colonel Benjamin Loring, has been received from Germany, and placed in Divinity Hall. It is to be kept by itself, and to be called the Loring Library.

"The magnificent library also, which was bequeathed by the late Henry B. Wales, has been received and deposited in appropriate cases, which were furnished by the bounty of George W. Wales, Esq., a brother of the testator ; who has further shewn his disposition to carry out the intentions of his brother, by binding at his own expense many volumes, forming portions of sets, in a corresponding style of beauty to the others. It should be mentioned also, that the late Mr. Henry B. Wales, in addition to this large bequest, has provided in his will, that, on the occurrence of a future event, forty thousand dollars shall be paid to Harvard College for the foundation of a Professorship of the Sanscrit Language and Literature, a study in which that learned and liberal gentleman was much interested.

"A department in the College filled by a gentleman of the highest scientific character and fitness, but most inadequately supported, has been placed on a favourable footing by a donation of property to the amount of ten thousand dollars by Thomas Lee, Esq., the income of which is to be added to the stipend of Dr. Jeffries Wyman, Hersey Professor of Anatomy. It is interesting also to mention that another friend of science has provided additional resources to repay the services of the same eminent Professor.

"The fence surrounding the Botanic Garden had gone to decay, and, owing to the poverty of that department, the means of restoring it were not at the disposal of the corporation. A subscription, however, has been raised of one thousand and fifty dollars, through the instrumentality of Dr. Gray, which supplied the means for that purpose. It is very much to be desired, and is hoped, that the friends of the College and of that interesting branch of study will place this department in a condition of greater respectability and increased usefulness.

"A portrait of the late Dr. Francis W. P. Greenwood, a beloved and respected

son of the College, was presented by Dr. George Hayward, to be deposited in the gallery of Harvard Hall.

"The Hon. Francis C. Gray, for many years a Fellow of the College, and always its strong friend and advocate, by his last will bestowed upon the College his collection of engravings, the result of many years of the most enlightened zeal and liberality in collecting the rarest and finest specimens of this art. The cost of this collection was very large; but by extraordinary efforts and good fortune many engravings were obtained which could hardly be duplicated at any expense. This valuable collection, which should be kept sacredly from diminution or damage, he has confided to the College, making a probable provision in the future for a sum to be paid to the College adequate to that end. It is not improbable, also, that his benefactions will eventually be made more extensive and important.

"The late venerable Samuel Hoar, the friend of Harvard College, as of every interest of religion and learning, gave to her his parting blessing in a bequest of one thousand dollars to the Divinity School.

"Mrs Eliza W. Haven, the widow of the late Nathaniel Appleton Haven, Jr., gave to the University Library his valuable collection of books in the ancient classical language and literature, as a memorial of his attachment to his Alma Mater and of the studies in which he delighted and reached a great proficiency.

"The Theological department of the University has been suffering for some time from want of funds to furnish a proper amount of instruction in some important branches of study. This want has been temporarily met by an agreement by the Society for the Promotion of Theological Education to furnish, for the period of six years, the sum of twelve hundred dollars a year, to be paid one-half to each of two Professors in addition to those now employed, who are to furnish for this stipend instruction in Ecclesiastical History and Systematic Theology.

"The late William Pickman, Esq., of Salem, has bequeathed to the College, in aid of its general funds, the sum of three thousand dollars.

"The late Ward Nicholas Boylston many years since gave to the College a fund, to accumulate by interest or otherwise until sufficient to erect a stone building for a Museum of Anatomy and a Chemical Laboratory; which fund, by the accumulation of interest alone, has reached the amount of twenty-three thousand dollars. As a pressing want is now felt for such a structure, a subscription has been raised of seventeen thousand dollars, which will, added to that fund, nearly pay for the erection of the building, which will be completed at an early day. This is considered an important addition to the facilities of instruction at Cambridge, and the happy result is owing mainly to the exertions of Professor Cooke, aided essentially by John E. Thayer, Esq.

"Having completed about the term during which I contemplated filling this office, I have surrendered the trust to the corporation, with a grateful sense of the confidence reposed in me, and the constant aid and kindness extended to me by them. I should be wanting to my own feelings if I did not also express my thanks to my clerk, Mr. James S. Barbour, whose intelligence, faithfulness and integrity have almost entirely relieved me from any feelings of anxiety in the performance of the responsible duties of my office.

"William T. Andrews.

"October 6, 1857."

---

THE UNITARIAN CHURCHES IN AUSTRALIA.

Pleasant reports reach us from time to time of the condition and prospects of the Unitarian churches at our antipodes. At Melbourne, the pulpit vacated by the retirement of Mr. Maxwell Davidson is, we are pleased to see, occupied by Rev. Henry Higginson, brother of Rev. Edward Higginson, and formerly a student of Manchester College, York, who has, after some years of withdrawment from ministerial duties, returned to his original profession. We should be glad to learn that our Australian Unitarian brethren could find occasion for calling into exercise the ministerial services of Rev. William Bowen, who has recently settled in the neighbourhood of Melbourne. In England, his services were greatly valued by more than one of our congregations in the midland counties.—What the condition of the Unitarian church at Adelaide is, we learn from a paragraph from the "People's Journal," dated Adelaide, Oct. 7, 1857:

"*Unitarian Christian Church.*—The anniversary meetings of this congregation were held on Friday, October 2nd. The business meeting was held in the church, and was presided over by the Hon. Charles Davies, M.D. The report of the Committee for the past year, together with the Treasurer's accounts, was read and confirmed, and the officers for the ensuing year appointed. The social meeting of the members of the church was held in the evening in Messrs. Clark's store, Blyth Street, which was tastefully decorated with evergreens and flowers by the ladies of the

congregation ; about 150 persons sat down to an excellent tea, after which the chair was taken by Arthur Hardy, Esq., J.P. After an introductory address by the Chairman, Chas. Bonney, Esq., M.P., moved—'That the members of the Adelaide Unitarian Christian Church desire to congratulate their esteemed Pastor on the progress which the cause of truth has made under his ministry, and to express their sincere hope that it may for many years continue its prosperous career under his able guidance.' This motion was seconded by Mr. A. S. Clark, and carried by acclamation. The Rev. Mr. Woods responded in an able and feeling address, and concluded by moving—'That the members of this Church desire to express their sympathy with the sister Churches of Sydney and Melbourne, and their hope that their efforts to spread abroad the true spirit of Christianity may, by the blessing of Almighty God, be crowned with success.' With this was coupled the best wishes of the meeting for the successful ministry of the Rev. Henry Higginson. Mr. Higginson, in acknowledging the resolution, gave an interesting account of the state and prospects of the Melbourne congregation, of whose church he has, by a unanimous call of the members, become the pastor. The Hon. John Baker called the attention of the meeting to the debt on the church, and in an able and practical manner urged an effort for its reduction. The motion was seconded by Mr. E. M. Martin, and several subscriptions were promised. Addresses were also delivered by Mr. William Kay and Mr. Howard Clark, on the subject of the Unitarian Christian Churches of Europe and America, and Free Inquiry. Thanks were voted to the ladies and the choir for their services, to the Messrs. Clark for the use of the room, and to the Chairman, and the meeting was closed with prayer by Mr. Woods. The choir of the church, aided by a band of music, greatly increased the pleasure of the meeting by a well-selected performance of sacred music."

---

AN AMERICAN ANTI-UNITARIAN JURY.

If the facts of the case are rightly represented in the following paragraph, which we find in the *Boston Christian Register* of Jan. 2, religious bigotry is sometimes allowed to do its evil work in courts of law on the other as well as on this side of the Atlantic. We need not suppose from the paragraph that the relatives of the late Mr. Loring advanced the daring plea that Unitarianism was in itself evidence of an unsound mind.

"There is a motion pending for a new trial in the Groton will case. The jurors in this case are very strongly suspected of having been governed by their religious feelings, rather than by the evidence. Mr. Jonathan Loring left a portion of his estate to the Unitarian society of Groton. Some of the heirs, who would otherwise have obtained this sum, set up the plea that the testator was not of sound and disposing mind. We understand that the evidence tending to shew this was absolutely worthless in every respect. And the jury did not venture to break the will on that ground. But the temptation to rob the Unitarians of Groton of six or seven thousand dollars was too strong to be resisted, so a verdict was returned against the will, on the ground that he who made it had been 'unduly influenced.'"

---

PROSPECTS OF POSITIVISM IN FRANCE.

*La Revue Chretienne* for October gives extracts from *La Revue Philosophique et Religieuse* in respect to the death and testament of *Auguste Comte ;* from which it appears that he has named no successor to the supremacy in his school, because he could find no one worthy to succeed him. He has, however, appoined M. Magum, "*eminent proletaire positiviste,*" the perpetual President of the Positive Society, and M. Lafitte perpetual President of his executors. "Inasmuch as the normal transmission of the spiritual power of the first grand priest of humanity could not be affected, the empirical method will have its rights, i. e. the future successor will need to conquer a moral authority by the ascendancy which he will know how to deserve over his contemporaries, through his instruction, his example and his labours." His thirteen executors have issued a circular, in which, among other things, they require the payment of an annual contribution for the rent of the apartments of Comte, in order that they may be preserved intact and unaltered. The *Revue Chretienne* wisely advises that the rooms be not hired for too long a term. It styles the system a popedom of a species with all the oppression of the Middle Ages, but without God and Conscience, which that Papacy had.

---

CLOVER-STREET CHAPEL, ROCHDALE.

The annual tea-party and congregational meeting was held on Tuesday, Jan. 12, under the presidency of R. T. Heape, Esq., Mayor of Rochdale. The chapel was filled with an assemblage heartily sympathizing with the speakers and with each other,

and presented a very cheering and animated appearance, adorned as it was with wreaths of evergreens and flowers, and, still better, with kindly and happy faces. The subjects spoken to included "The Pure Gospel of Christ"—"The Clover-Street Congregation" — "Home Missions"—"The Ministry to the Poor"—"Sunday-Schools" — "The Unitarian Laity." The speakers were Revds. J. R. Beard, D.D., F. Bishop, J. P. Ham, L. Taplin, J. Wilkinson and J. Wright, B.A., Messrs. B. Heape, B. Glover, E. Clegg, Shawcross, H. Hills, &c. The references to Mr. Wilkinson's long-continued and single-minded labours in the congregation and in other congregations in the district, and his observations on behalf of himself and his people, were especially interesting. The thanks given to the Chairman at the conclusion of the meeting were enthusiastic, and his acknowledgment of them, marked by deep feeling, drew a response from every heart.

SWANSEA.

The Rev. MATTHEW GIBSON has been compelled by regard to the health of his family to resign his duties as minister of the Unitarian congregation at Swansea. At a general meeting of the congregation held on Monday, Dec. 21, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:—"That this congregation, taking the earliest opportunity of testifying and recording their high appreciation of the services of the Rev. Mr. Gibson, and of the efficiency with which he has performed the duties of Pastor, desire to express their great regret that he is compelled to leave them, and at the same time their earnest hope that he and his family may enjoy all worldly prosperity and happiness, and be partakers hereafter of that unspeakable joy which he has so well and so constantly expressed as being the future reward of the pious and good. That the foregoing resolution be conveyed to Mr. Gibson, with a purse of Fifty Sovereigns, of which the congregation request his acceptance."—On Jan. 5th, this resolution was presented to Mr. Gibson, together with a purse of gold.

The congregation at Swansea have secured the services of the Rev. EDWARD HIGGINSON, who will resign his pulpit at Wakefield to enter on his new duties early in April. By this removal, not only the congregation but the town of Wakefield will sustain a severe loss; but the Unitarian church will probably gain by the transfer of his zeal and abilities to so promising a field of influence as Swansea.

SCHOOL MEETING AT CHESTER.

On Monday evening, Jan. 11th, the annual Sunday-school tea-party was held in the school-rooms, Crook-Street chapel, Chester. The partition between the boys' and girls' school-room being removed, the two rooms were for this occasion thrown into one, and the walls tastefully decorated with banners, flags, pictures and evergreens. A plentiful tea was provided, to which 120 persons sat down, about 80 being children belonging to the Sunday-school. The Rev. S. F. Macdonald, minister of the chapel, briefly addressed the children; various hymns were sung and recitations given; and the whole concluded with a display of views on the magic lantern, of great interest and variety, which were heartily applauded by the juveniles. After votes of thanks passed to the conductors and benefactors of the school, the meeting, which was a very pleasant one, separated.

# MARRIAGES.

1857. Oct. 24, at Port Elizabeth, the Cape of Good Hope, Mr. JOSEPH ROBBERDS HOLLAND to SARAH, daughter of Rev. Noah JONES, of Gateacre, near Liverpool.

Nov. 30, at the Unitarian chapel, Rotherham, by Rev. Brooke Herford, Mr. MORRIS BRETTELL to MARY, daughter of Rev. R. SHENTON, Great Hucklow, Derbyshire.

Dec. 3, HOWARD, youngest son of Thos. HUTTON, Esq., of Elm Park, near Dublin, to EMMA, eldest daughter of Archibald KENRICK, Esq., of West Bromwich.

Dec. 8, at the High-Pavement chapel, Nottingham, by Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, Mr. WILLIAM FACON to Miss ANNE CRESSEY, both of Nottingham.

Dec. 13, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. WM. MAYOH, of Egerton, to JANE, daughter of Rev. William PROBERT, of Walmsley.

Dec. 25, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. JAMES NIELD to CHARLOTTE, daughter of Mr. Peter CHARLTON.

At the Unitarian chapel, Little Portland Street, by Rev. E. Tagart, Mr. G. CLEGG, of Pentonville, to HELEN, only daughter of Mr. ROSEWELL, of Windmill Street.

Lately, at the Unitarian chapel, Wisbech, by Rev. C. C. Coe, of Leicester, Mr. ALFRED BERRY, of Upwell, to SUSAN, eldest daughter of Mr. W. LINCOLN, of Wisbech.

# OBITUARY.

1858. Jan. 4, at her residence, Westmead, near Bridport, aged 79, ELIZABETH, widow of the late John Channon LEE, Esq., and daughter of the late Thomas Collins Colfox, Esq.

Mrs. Lee was the last of a generation that has largely helped to give an honoured name and a high character to the town in which its members lived, and to the Christian congregation with which for many years they were connected. Her mortal remains were interred in the family vault near the chapel wherein she loved to worship, when a tribute of affectionate regard and respect was paid to her memory by her attached and now bereaved minister. We extract from it the following estimate of her character :

"I do not wish to speak of our friend in any strain of studied eulogy. I am not anxious to praise her—there is no need. To her life, to the memory of all who really knew her, I calmly leave the award. And certainly, if there ever was a woman who would have nothing but truth spoken of her, nothing strained or exaggerated said of her, it was our friend whose mortal remains are here before us: yet, in view of this fact, I unhesitatingly affirm that from every circle in which she moved, whether it were domestic, social or public, one of its chief ornaments is gone.

"I scarcely dare to enter the apartments of her domestic life, so sacred are they to me. I will tread lightly within the hallowed precincts ; but I must stand there and raise the curtain for a moment, that the living beauty of that life may bear testimony to her worth, and afford us a lesson that we need. How carefully was its spiritual economy arranged ! Her first thought and well-nigh her last was, that her dependents should be brought beneath Christian influences ; and few things distressed her more than to find that any one of them was indifferent to the means of religious growth. Her household plans were all laid with principal reference to this great end. Her younger domestics were every Sabbath-day brought under her own religious instruction, while her older servants were engaged, during no inconsiderable portions of their time, in preparing and dispensing charities that made Westmead a most welcome resort to many. I never entered that dwelling, nor was I ever admitted to the privacy of its arrangements, without feeling that our friend had made 'the solid virtues of integrity and faith its foundation-stones, the graces of forbearance and meekness and gentleness its chief embellishments, the charities of life its necessary furniture, the hopes of immortality its brightest lights, and the peace which comes of trust its most fragrant incense.'

"Coming forth into the wider circle of social life, the same influences go forth from her there, and attract toward her the uniform respect, esteem and love of those who knew her. The artless sincerity which was the chief grace of her womanhood offered a constant, generally a silent, but sometimes an indignant, protest against that poor slavery to names, appearances and outsides, which is the bane of modern society. She could not endure the hollow courtesies and transparent artifices that so much deform the social intercourse of our day. But where she found a generous frankness, or where she beheld a quiet, unassuming, sterling character, or where she saw a cultivated and tenderly-nurtured being reduced to humble circumstances, there her impulsive, generous nature went forth seeking and giving the blessings of a Christian friendship, that was true through all trial, strong in all difficulty, most tender and sympathetic in all distress and bereavement. What a privilege it was to be within the circle of that friendship — to share her friendly offices and generous hospitalities ! So simple, so unpretending, so frank was she, that she spread around all she truly loved the unconstrained and blessed feeling of one's own home. A quiet, womanly dignity, a genial, hearty spirit, united with a love of innocent pleasure, marked her as a true-souled woman and a delightful companion. Living at all times in a modest and self-denying manner, she was always ready with generous sympathies for others. How many are the families and scattered individuals whose interests and wants she followed with solicitude and bounty ! Self-forgetful, unsparing of labour, full of faith in God and goodness, however doubtful she grew, amid the vices of society, of the progress of humanity, she sought constantly to comfort and reclaim the weak and erring : and the last mission on which she sent him who had so often been her almoner to the poor, and who deemed it at once an honour and a privilege to be her pastor and her friend, was in search of information that should help to raise the poor around her to greater comfort, dignity and virtue.*

* The allusion is to a journey for the purpose of obtaining information respect-

"Our friend shrank from public gaze, as all true women do; but she was far from indifferent to public life. There was no philanthropic, moral or religious movement in the town of her birth to which she was not alive. Day by day did she keep her watchful eye upon the progress of every institution that she thought would purify and elevate the degraded and the lost around her. With a thankfulness and gratitude I shall never forget, she saw the noble buildings for our General Schools completed; and with an unflagging interest she followed all the developments of the classes or schools connected with this place of worship. Here she believed the chief treasure was dispensed, and here her heart ever was. She had a passionate devotion to Christ as the Sent of God, as the manifestation of the Father—and she identified with Christianity what was here taught, so completely, that her whole religious feeling flowed out in devout love for the services of this house of God, and for all the other instrumentalities whereby that teaching was dispensed. Autumn after autumn would she leave her pleasant residence and take up her abode in some less comfortable dwelling in the town, chiefly that she might be able regularly to attend the social worship here observed. Ah! how faithfully, how diligently, and how generously, did she use all the means of grace, observe all the ordinances of religion, and support all the institutions of the gospel! She loved them for their own sake; and so dearly did she love them, that to see the churches of our faith flourishing in old communities or founded in new ones, to help their needy or suffering ministers, and to develop all their collateral institutions, came to be well-nigh the characteristic desire of her life. Surely we need no brighter evidence that a branch whose fruits were so beneficent, could not but draw its life from the true vine.

"Thou friend of my earlier manhood and friend of my advancing years, farewell! Since the day when thou first tookest me as a stranger by the hand, to the moment when thou gavest me thy last blessed benediction on thy bed of death, how kind, how unaltered, how uniform has been thy deportment towards me! How hast thou ever overlooked my faults and my infirmities, and sustained me in every emergency and every trial by thine assistance and advice! How have I, as a pastor and a friend, leaned on thee as on one of my chief pillars and supports! How have thy kindnesses to me and to mine been as the kindnesses of Providence! True, if thou hadst power now, thou wouldst lay thy hand upon my mouth and bid me say no word of this; but the heart filled with love of thee refuses to do otherwise than offer on this occasion some faint and feeble tribute to thy worth."

J. L. S.

---

Jan. 10, at Sheffield, after a long and wasting illness, the Rev. B. T. Stannus, for several years the pastor of the Unitarian congregation in that place, and formerly minister of the Unitarian chapel in Edinburgh.—A friend has promised for our next No. an obituary memoir of Mr. Stannus.

---

Jan. 15, at Ventnor, Isle of Wight, aged 33, Paul John Fearon, Esq., of Hampstead. His high and pure character and mature judgment gave promise of extensive influence and usefulness, and were particularly adapted to inspire confidence and reliance. With a calm and quiet bearing he combined great tenderness of feeling and a deeply religious spirit. His death has occasioned heartfelt grief to a wide circle of friends. To many, as it seemed, his continuance in life on earth was almost necessary; but it behoves us to bow in humble piety to every dispensation of an All-wise Fatherly Providence. Within a short time he mourned the loss of two beloved members of his family, to whom he is now gone. His mortal remains were laid in the old churchyard at Bonchurch, the last earthly resting-place of W. Adams and of Sterling.

---

Jan. 19, at the residence of her son, Edward Johnson, Esq., Abbot's Cottage, Chester, aged 76, Elizabeth, widow of the late John Johnson, Esq., of Field House. During a life protracted beyond the term of three-score years and ten, she exhibited all the gentle virtues of the mother, the friend and the Christian lady. The recollection of her sweetness of temper, active goodness and unostentatious piety, embalmed in the hearts of her children, is shared with them by a very wide circle of friends; one of whom, in penning this simple tribute to the memory of a friend whom he has loved and revered for more than thirty years, can truly say that he never knew her utter a harsh word or give an unkind look. Surely such are the disciples whom Jesus loves!

---

ing the best means of establishing and conducting an industrial school for girls, the means for supporting which Mrs. Lee had given to trustees.

Erratum.—P. 49, line 25, for *England*, read *India*.